

A N
ANSWER
TO THE LATE
EXCEPTIONS
MADE BY
M^r Erasmus Warren
AGAINST THE
THEORY
OF THE
EARTH.



L O N D O N,

Printed by *R. Norton*, for *Walter Kettilby*, at the Bishop's
Head in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, 1690.

W. G. A.

1871

1872

1873

1874

1875

1876

1877

1878

1879

AN ANSWER

To the late

EXCEPTIONS

MADE BY

M^r ERASMUS WARREN

AGAINST

The THEORY of the EARTH.



IF it be a Civility to return a speedy Answer to a demand or a message, I will not fail to pay that respect to the late Author of *Exceptions against the Theory of the Earth*. I know, short follies, and short quarrels, are the best: and to offer satisfaction at the first opportunity, is the fairest way to put an end to controversies. Besides, such personal altercations as these, are but *res periturae*, which do not deserve much time or study; but, like Repartees, are best made off hand, and never thought on more. I only desire that friendliness, that some allowance may be made as to unaccuracy of style: which is always allow'd in hasty dispatches.

I shall make no excursions from the Subject, nor use any other method than to follow the learned *Exceptor* from Chapter to Chapter, and observe his steps and motions, so far as they are contrary to the Theory. But if he divert out of his way, for his pleasure, or other reasons best known to himself, I may take notice of it perhaps, but shall not follow him any further than my business leads me; having no design to abridge his liberty, but to defend my own Writings where they are attackt. Give me leave therefore, without any other preface or ceremony, to fall to our work.

E X C E P T I O N S.

C H A P. I.

Pag. 44.

THIS Chapter is only an Introduction, and treats of other things, without any particular opposition to the Theory. And therefore I shall only give you the Conclusion of it, in the Author's own words: *So much for the first Chapter; which may be reckoned as an Introduction to the following Discourse. Which if any shall look upon as a Collection of Notes somewhat confusedly put together, rather than a formal, well digested Treatise, they will entertain the best or truest Idea of it.* A severe Censure: But every man best understands his own works.

C H A P. II.

Pag. 45.

HERE he begins to enter upon particular Exceptions: and his first head is against the *Formation of the Earth*, as explain'd by the Theory. To this he gives but one exception in this chapter: Namely, that *It would have taken up too much time. The World being made in six days.* Whereas many separations of the Chaos and of the Elements, were to be made, according to the Theory, which could not be dispatch'd in so short a time. To this Exception the general Answer may be this; either you take the Hypothesis of an ordinary Providence, or of an extraordinary, as to the time allowed for the Formation of the Earth; If you proceed according to an ordinary Providence, the formation of the Earth would require much more time than Six days. But if according to an extraordinary, you may suppose it made in six minutes, if you please. 'Twas plain work, and a simple process, according to the Theory; consisting only of such and such separations, and a Concretion: And either of these might be accelerated, and dispatch'd in a longer or shorter time, as Providence thought fit.

How-

The Theory of the Earth.

3

However this Objection does not come well from the hands of this Author, who makes all the Mountains of the Earth, (the most operose part of it, as one would think) to be rais'd in a small parcel of a day, by the heat and action of the Sun. As we shall find in the 10th. Chapter, hereafter. He seems to proceed by natural Causes, for such are the heat and action of the Sun: and if so, he will find himself as much straiten'd for time, as the Theorist can be. But if he say, the work of Nature and of the Sun was accelerated by an extraordinary power, he must allow us to say the same thing of the Separations of the Chaos, and the first Concretion of the Earth. For he cannot reasonably debar us that liberty which he takes himself, unless we have debarr'd and excluded our selves. Now 'tis plain the Theorist never excluded an extraordinary Providence in the formation and construction of the Earth; as appears and is openly exprest in many parts of the Theory. See, if you please, the conclusion of the fifth Chapter, which treats about the formation of the Earth. The last paragraph is this: *Give me leave onely, before we proceed any further, to annex here a short Advertisement, concerning the Causes of this wonderful Structure of the first Earth: 'Tis true, we have propos'd the Natural Causes of it, and I do not know wherein our Explication is false or defective; but in things of this kind we may easily be too credulous. And this Structure is so marvellous, that it ought rather to be consider'd as a particular effect of the Divine Art, than as the work of Nature. The whole Globe of the water vaulted over, and the exteriour Earth hanging above the Deep, sustain'd by nothing but its own measures and manner of Construction: A building without foundation or Corner-stone. This seems to be a piece of Divine Geometry or Architecture; and to this, I think, is to be refer'd that magnificent Challenge which God Almighty made to Job; Where was thou when I laid the foundations of the Earth? Declare, &c. Moses also, when he had describ'd the Chaos, saith, The Spirit of God mov'd upon, or sat brooding upon the face of the waters; without all doubt to produce some effects there. And St. Peter, when he speaks of the form of the Ante-diluvian Earth, how it stood in reference to the waters,*

Eng. Theor.
p. 65.

An Answer to the late Exceptions made against waters, adds, By the word of God, or by the wisdom of God it was made so. And this same wisdom of God, in the Proverbs, as we observed before, takes notice of this very piece of work in the formation of the Earth: When he set an Orb over the face of the Deep, I was there. Wherefore to the great Architect, who made the boundless Universe out of nothing, and form'd the Earth out of a Chaos, let the praise of the whole work, and particularly of this Master-piece, for ever with all honour be given. In like manner, there is a larger account of Providence, both Ordinary and Extraordinary, as to the Revolutions of the Natural World, in the last Paragraph of the 8th. Chapter; and like reflections are made in other places when occasion is offer'd.

Eng. Theor.
p. 106, 107.

We have not therefore any where excluded the influence and benefit of superiour causes, where the case requires it. Especially when 'tis only to modify the effect, as to time and dispatch. And in that case none will have more need of it than himself, as we shall find in the examination of his Tenth Chapter, about the Origine of Mountains.

The rest of this Second Chapter is spent in three Excursions. One in justifying the Cartesian way of forming Light and the Sun, as agreeable to *Moses*. The Second about the *Jewish Cabala*, and *Cabalistical interpretations*. And the Third about *Mystical numbers*. But the Theory not being concern'd in these things, I leave them to the Author and his Readers, to enjoy the pleasure and profit of them, and proceed to the Third Chapter.

C H A P. III.

p. 73.

IN This Chapter a Second Exception against the formation of the Earth, as propos'd in the Theory, is alledg'd: And 'tis this, The fluctuation of the Chaos, or of that first watery Globe, would hinder, he says, any Concretion of Earth upon its surface. Not that there were Winds or Storms then, to agitate those waters. Neither would the motion of the Earth, or the rotation of that Globe, disturb them, as he allows there. But the disturbance would have
rise

p. 74. lin.
18, 19.

The Theory of the Earth.

5

rise from Tides, or the ebbings and flowings of that great Ocean: which, he says, must have been then, as well as now. And the reason he gives is this; Because the Flux and Reflux of the Sea depend upon the Moon: And the Moon was then present, as he says, in our Heavens, or in our Vortex: and therefore would have the same effect then, upon that Body of waters which lay under it, that it hath now upon the Sea.

That the Moon was in the Heavens, and in our Neighbourhood, when the Earth was form'd, he proves from the Six-days Creation: and spends two or three pages in wit and scolding upon this subject. p. 77, 78, 79. But, with his leave, when all is done, his argument will be of no force, unless he can prove that *the Fourth Day's Creation was before the Third*. I confess, I have heard of a wager that was lost upon a like case, namely, whether *Henry the 8th.* was before *Henry the 7th*? But that was done by complot in the Company, to whom it was referr'd to decide the Question. We have no plot here, but appeal fairly to that Judge the Excepter hath chosen, namely to Scripture, which tells us, that the Moon was made the *4th.* Day and the Earth was form'd the *3d.* Therefore unless the *4th.* Day was before the *3d.* the Moon could not hinder the formation of the Earth.

But, I hope, say you, this is a misrepresentation. The Animadverter sure would not put the matter upon this issue. Yes, he does. For when he had oppos'd to our Formation of the Earth, the Fluctuation of the Waters: caus'd, as he phrases it, by the *bulkie presence* of the Moon, He concludes with these words, (p. 77. Paragr. 3.) *But in reference to this matter, there is a Doubt made by the Theorist, which must be consider'd and removed. Otherwise most of what hath been said, touching the instability and fluctuation of these Waters, will be vain and groundless. The Doubt is, Whether the Moon were then in our neighbourhood.* You see that matter is put upon this issue, Whether the Moon was in the Neighbourhood of the Earth, at the time of its formation. We say she was not, and prove it by this plain argument: If she was not in Being at that time, she was not in our Neighbourhood: But unless the
4th.

An Answer to the late Exceptions made against

4th. day was before the 3d. she was not in Being. *Ergo.*

But after all, If the Moon had been present then, and there had been Tides, or any other fluctuation towards the Poles, we have no reason to believe, according to the experiences we have now, that that would have hinder'd the formation of the Earth, upon the surface of the Chaos. For why should they have hinder'd that more, than they do the formation of Ice upon the Surface of the Sea? We know, in cold Regions, the Seas are frozen, notwithstanding their Tides. And in the mouths of Rivers, where there is both the current and stream of the River on one hand, and the counter-current of the Tides on the other, these together cannot hinder the Concretion that is made on the Surface of the Water. And our water is a substance more thin, and easily broken, than that tenacious film was, that cover'd the Chaos. WHEREFORE, upon all suppositions, we have reason to conclude, that no fluctuations of the Chaos could hinder the formation of the First Earth.

p. 79.

Lastly, The Observator opposes the reasons that are given by the Theorist, *why the presence of the Moon was less needful in the first World.* Namely, *because there were no long Winter-nights: nor the great Pool of the Sea to move or govern.* As to the Second reason, 'tis onely Hypothetical: and if the Hypothesis be true, *That there was no open Sea at that time,* (which must be else-where examin'd) the consequence is certainly true. But as to the first reason, He will not allow the Consequence, tho' the Hypothesis be admitted. For he says, *As there were no long Winter-nights then, so there were no short Summer ones neither.* So that set but the one against the other, and the presence of the Moon may seem to have been as needful then, in regard of the length of nights, as she is now. This looks like a witty observation, but it does not reach the point. Is there as much need of the Moon in Spain, as in Lapland, or the Northern Countries? There is as much Night in one place as another, within the compass of a Year: but the great inconvenience is, when the Night falls upon the hours of Travel, or the hours of work and business. For if it fall onely upon hours of sleep, or
of

7

The Theory of the Earth.

of rest and retirement: as it does certainly more in *Spain*, and in those Climates that approach nearer to an Equinox, the Moon is there less necessary in that respect. We can sleep without Moon-shine, or without Light; but we cannot travel, or do business abroad, without hazard and great inconvenience, if there be no light. So that the reason of the Theorist holds good *viz.* That there would be more necessity of Moon shine in long Winter-Nights; than in a perpetual Equinox.

We proceed now to the rest of this Chapter, which is made up of some secondary Charges against this part of the Theory, concerning the Chaos and the Formation of the first Earth. As first, that it is *precarious*: Secondly, *Unphilosophical*: and Thirdly, *Antiscriptural*, which we shall answer in order. He seems to offer at three or four instances of *precariousness*, as to the ingredients of the Chaos, their proportions, and separations. But his quarrel is chiefly with the oily particles. These he will scarce allow at all: nor that they could separate themselves, in due time, to receive the Terrestrial: at least in due proportions.

First, He would have no oily particles in the Chaos. But why so, I pray? what proof or just exception is there against them? Why may there not be original Oily particles, as well as original Salt particles? Such as your great master *D. Cartes* supposes. He who considers that vast quantity of Oleaginous matter that is dispersed every where: in Vegetables, in Animals, and in many sorts of Earths: And that this must have been from the beginning, or as soon as the Earth had any furniture: will see reason to believe that such particles must be thought Original and Primeval. Not forg'd below the Abyss, and extracted from the inferior regions of the Earth. For that would require a process of many ages; whereas these being the principles of Fertility, it is reasonable to suppose that a New World abounds with them more than an Old one. Lastly, if we suppose Oily particles to be tenuous and branchy, as your Philosopher does, too gross to be Air, and too light for Water: Why should we imagine that in that vast mass and variety of particles,

B

whereof

*p. 80, 81.
p. 83.*

*Prin. ph. l.
4. s. 84.
Meteor.
c. 1. s. 8.*

An Answer to the late Exceptions made against

whereof the Chaos consisted, there should not be any of this figure, as well as of others? Or, what reason is there to suppose, that there are none of that figure, but what are brought from the inferiour Regions of the Earth? For, of all others, these seem to be the most unlikely, if not incapable, of being extracted from thence. And if there be only a gradual difference, in magnitude and mobility, betwixt the particles of Air and of Oil, as that Philosopher seems to suppose, why must we exclude these degrees, and yet admit the higher and lower?

Prin. phil.
l. 4. s. 76.

The second thing which he charges with *precariousness*, is the separation of this Oily matter, in due time, so as to make a mixture and concretion with the terrestrial particles that fell from above. This objection was both made and answered by the Theorist: which the Observator might have vouchsaf'd to have taken notice of: and either confuted the answer, or spar'd himself the pains of repeating the objection.

Eng. Theor.
p. 58, 59.

The third *precariousness* is concerning the quantity and proportion of these particles: and the fourth, concerning the quantity and proportion of the Water. The Excepter, it seems, would have had the Theorist to have gag'd these liquors, and told him the just measure and proportion of each. But in what Theory or Hypothesis is that done? Has his great Philosopher, in his Hypothesis of *Three Elements*, (which the Excepter makes use of, p. 52.) Or in his several Regions of the uniform'd Earth, in the *4th Book of his Principles*, defin'd the quantity and dimensions of each? Or in the Mineral particles and juices, which he draws from the lower Regions, does he determine the quantity of them? And yet these, by their excess or defect, might be of great inconvenience to the World. Neither do I censure him for these things, as *precarious*. For when the nature of a thing admits a latitude, the original quantity of it is left to be determin'd by the effects: and the Hypothesis stands good, if neither any thing antecedent, nor any present *phenomena* can be alledged against it.

But if these examples from his great Philosopher, be not sufficient, I will give him one from an Author beyond

beyond all exception: and that is from himself. Does the Animadverter in his new Hypothesis concerning the Deluge, *ch.* 15. give us the just proportions of his Rock-water, and the just proportions of his Rain-water, that concurred to make the Deluge? I find no calculations there, but general expressions, that the one was far greater than the other: and that may be easily presumed concerning the oily substance and the watery in the Chaos. What scruples therefore p. 80, 81. he raises in reference to the Chaos, against the Theorist, for not having demonstrated the proportions of the liquors of the Abyss, fall upon his own Hypothesis, for the same or greater reasons. And you know what the old verse says, *Turpe est Doctori, cum culpa redarguit ipsum.*

But however, He will have such exceptions to stand p. 81. good against the Theorist, tho' they are not good against other persons. Because the Theorist

stands upon * terms of certainty; and in one place of his Book, has this sentence, *Ego quidem, &c.* These words, I think, are very little exceptionable, if they be taken with the Context. For this Evidence and certainty which the Theorist speaks of, is brought in there in opposition to

* *Ego quidem in eâ sum sententiâ, si in harum rerum de quibus agitur cognitionem, aut aliarum quarumcunque, quæ momenti sunt, visum fuerit Deo aut Naturæ ut pateret hominibus ratio perveniendi, ratio illa certa est, & in aliquâ clarâ & invictâ evidentia fundata: non conjecturalis, vaga, & dubia. Qualem nempe ii, qui optime utuntur libertate suâ, & qui maxime sibi cavent ab erroribus, nunquam amplectentur.*

such uncertain arguments as are taken from the interpretation of *Fables* and *Symbols*: or from *Etymologies* and *Grammatical Criticisms*, which are expressly mention'd in the preceding discourse. And yet this sentence, because it might be taken in too great an extent, is left out in the 2^d Edition of the Theory, and therefore none had reason to insist upon it. But I see the Excepter puts himself into a state of War, and thinks there is no foul play against an Enemy.

So much for his charge of *precariousness*. We now come to the 2^d, which is call'd *unphilosophicalness*. And why is the Theorist, in this case, unphilosophical? Because, says the Excepter, He supposes Terrestrial particles to be dispers'd through the whole Sphere of the Chaos, as high as the Moon. And why not, pray, if it be a meer Chaos? where, antecedently to separa-

An Answer to the late Exceptions made against

tions, all things are mixt and blended without distinction of gravity or levity. Otherwise it is not a meer Chaos. And when separations begin to be made, and distinction of parts and regions, so far it is ceasing to be a meer Chaos. But then, says the Observator, why did not the Moon come down, as well as these Terrestrial particles? I answer by another question, Why does not the Moon come down now? Seeing she is still in our Vortex, and at the same distance; and so the same reason which keeps her up now, kept her up then. Which reason he will not be at a loss to understand, if he understand the principles of his great Philosopher.

We come now to the last charge, That the Theory, in this part of it, is *Antiscriptural*. And why so? because it supposes the Chaos *dark*, whereas the Scripture says there was Light the first day. Well, but does the Scripture say that the Chaos was thoroughly illuminated the first day? the Excepter, as I remember, makes the primigenial Light to have been the Rudiment of a Sun: and calls it there a *faint light*, and a *feeble light*; and in this place, a *faint glimmering*. If then the Sun, in all its strength and glory, cannot sometimes dispel a mist out of the Air, what could this *faint, feeble glimmering* do, towards the dissipation of such a gross caliginous opacity, as that was? This Light might be sufficient to make some distinction of Day and Night in the Skies; and we do not find any other mark of its strength in Scripture, nor any other use made of it.

Pag. 52.

lin. 17.

lin. 27.

p. 78.

p. 299. pen.

So we have done with this Chapter. Give me leave only, without offence, to observe the style of the Excepter in reference to Scripture and the Theory. He is apt to call every thing *antiscriptural*, that suits not his Sence. Neither is that enough, but he must also call it a *bold affront* to Scripture. He confesses, he hath made a *little bold* with Scripture himself, in his new Hypothesis. How much that *little* will prove, we shall see hereafter. But however as to that hard word, *affront*, a discreet man, as he is not apt to give an affront, so neither is he forward to call every cross word an affront. Both those humours are extremes, and breed

breed quarrels. Suppose a Man should say boldly, God Almighty *hath no right hand*. Oh, might the Animadverter cry, *That's a bold affront to Scripture*: For, I can shew you many and plain Texts of Scripture, both in the Old Testament, and in the New Testament; where express mention is made of God's *Right Hand*. And will you offer to oppose *Reason* and *Philosophy* to express words of Scripture, often repeated, and in both Testaments? *O Tempora, O Mores*. So far as my observation reaches, weak reasons commonly produce strong passions. When a Man hath clear reasons, they satisfy and quiet the mind, and he is not much concern'd whether others receive his notions, or no. But when we have a strong aversion to an opinion, from other Motives and Considerations: and find our reasons doubtful or insufficient, then, according to the course of humane nature, the passions rise for a further assistance: and what is wanting in point of argument, is made up by invectives and aggravations.

CHAP. IV.

THIS Chapter is chiefly concerning the *Central Fire*, and the *Origine* of the *Chaos*. Of both which the Theorist had declared he would not treat. And 'tis an unreasonable violence to force an Author to treat of what things we please, and not allow him to prescribe bounds to his own discourse. As to the first of these, see what the Theorist hath said, *Engl. Theor.* p. 48. 64. & 324. By which passages it is evident, that he did not meddle with the Central parts of the Earth: nor thought it necessary for his Hypothesis. As is also more fully express'd in the *Latine* * Theory, p. 45. For, do but allow him a Chaos from the bottom of the Abyss, upwards to the Moon, and he desires no more for the formation of an habitable Earth. Neither is it the part of wisdom, to load a new subject with unnecessary curiosities.

p. 86.

* Si admittamus insuper Ignem Centralem, sive Massam ignis in centro Terræ: quod quidem non est hujus argumenti. Neque partem intimam Chaos, nisi obiter & pro forma, consideravi, cum ad rem nostram non spectet. Vid. etiam p. 186. edit. 2.

Then as to the Origine of the Chaos, see how the Theorist

Eng. Theor.
p. 324.

p. 88.

Theorist bounds his discourse as to that. *I did not think it necessary to carry the story and original of the Earth, higher than the Chaos, as Zoroaster and Orpheus seem to have done; but taking that for our foundation, which Antiquity sacred and profane does suppose, and natural reason approve and confirm, we have form'd the Earth from it.* To form an habitable Earth from a Chaos given, and to show all the great Periods and general Changes of that Earth, throughout the whole course of its duration, or while it remain'd an Earth, was the adequate design of the Theorist. And was this design so short or shallow, that it could not satisfy the great Soul of the Excepter? but it must be a *flaw* in the Hypothesis, that it did go higher than the Chaos. We content our selves with these bounds at present. And when a man declares that he will write only the *Roman History*, Will you say his work's imperfect, because it does not take in the *Persian* and *Assyrian*?

These things consider'd, to speak freely of this Chapter, it seems to me, in a great measure, impertinent. Unless it was design'd to show the learning of the Observator: who loves, I perceive, to dabble in Philosophy, tho' little to the purpose. For, as far as I see, his disquisitions generally end in Scepticism; He disputes first one way, and then another, and, at last, determines nothing. He rambles betwext *D. Cartes* and *Moses*, the *Rabbies*, the *Septuagint*, the *Platonists*, *Magnetisme*, *striate Particles*, and *præexistence of Souls*: and ends in nothing as to the formation of the Earth, which was to be the subject of the Chapter. We proceed therefore to the next, in hopes to meet with closer reasoning.

C H A P. V.

p. 106.

FROM the manner of the Earth's formation, the Excepter now proceeds to the *Form* of it, if compleated. And his first Exception is, That it would want *Waters* or *Rivers* to water it. He says there would either be no Rivers at all: or none, at least, in due time.

The Theorist hath replenisht that Earth with Rivers,
flowing

flowing from the extreme parts of it towards the middle, in continual streams: and watering, as a Garden, all the intermediate climates. And this constant supply of water was made from the Heavens, by an uninterrupted stream of Vapours: which had their course through the Air, from the middle parts of the Earth towards the extreme; and falling in Rains, return'd again upon the surface of the Earth, from the extreme parts to the middle. For that Earth being of an Oval, or something oblong figure, there would be a declivity all a-long, or descent, from the Polar parts towards the Equinoctial, which gave course and motion to these waters. And the vapors above never failing in their course, the Rivers would never fail below; but a perpetual Circulation would be establish'd, betwixt the waters of the Heavens and of the Earth.

This is a short account of the state of the Waters in the Primeval Earth. Which you may see represented and explain'd more at large, in the *2d. Book of the Theory, Chap. 5.* And this, I believe, is an Idea more easily conceived, than any we could form concerning the Waters and Rivers of the present Earth, if we had not experience of them. Suppose a Stranger that had never seen this Terraqueous Globe, where we live at present, but was told the general Form of it: How the Sea lies, how the Land, and what was the constitution of the Heavens: If this Stranger was askt his opinion, whether such an Earth was habitable: and particularly, whether they could have waters commodiously in such an Earth, and how the Inland Countries would be supplied? I am apt to think, he would find it more difficult (upon an Idea onely, without experience) to provide Waters for such an Earth, as ours is at present, than for such an one as the Primeval Earth was. 'Tis true, He would easily find Rains, possible and natural: but with no constancy or regularity; and these he might imagine would onely make transient torrents, not any fixt and permanent Rivers. But as for Fountains deriv'd from the Sea, and breaking out in higher grounds, I am apt to believe, all his Philosophy would not be able
to

14 *An Answer to the late Exceptions made against*

to make a clear discovery of them. But things that are familiar to us by experience, we think easie in speculation, or never enquire into the causes of them. Whereas, other things that never fall under our experience, tho' more simple and intelligible in themselves, we reject often as Paradoxes or Romances. Let this be applied to the present case, and we proceed to answer the Exceptions.

p. 114. Let us take that Exception first, as most material, that pretends there would have been no Rivers at all in the Primeval Earth, if it was of such a Form as the Theorist has describ'd. And for this He gives one grand Reason, *Because* the Regions towards the Poles, where the Rains are suppos'd to fall, and the Rivers to rise, would have been all frozen and congeal'd: and consequently no fit Sources of water for the rest of the Earth. Why we should think those Regions would be frozen, and the Rains that fell in them, he gives two Reasons, the Distance, and the Obliquity of the Sun. As also the experience we have now, of the coldness and frozenness of those parts of the Earth. But as to the Distance of the Sun, He confesses that is not the thing *that does onely or chiefly* make a Climate cold. He might have added, *particularly in that Earth, where the Sun was never at a greater distance than the Equator.* Then as to the Obliquity of the Sun, neither was that so great, nor so considerable, in the first Earth, as in the present. Because the Body of that lay in a direct position to the Sun, whereas the present Earth lies in an Oblique. And tho' the Polar circles or circumpolar parts of that Earth, did not lie so perpendicular to the Sun as the Equinoctial, and consequently were cooler, yet there was no danger of their being frozen or congeal'd. It was more the moisture and excessive Rains of those parts that made them uninhabitable, than the extreme coldness of the Climate, of it self. And if the Excepter had well consider'd the differences betwixt the present and primitive Earth: as to obliquity of position, and, that which follows from it, the length of Nights: He would have found no reason to have charg'd that Earth with *nipping and freezing cold*; where there was not,

p. 118.

The Theory of the Earth.

not, I believe, one morsel of Ice from one pole to another. But that will better appear, if we consider the causes of Cold.

There are three general causes of Cold: the distance of the Sun, his Obliquity, and his total Absence; I mean in the Nights. As to distance, that alone must be of little effect, seeing there are many Planets, (which must not be lookt upon as meer lumps of Ice) at a far greater distance from the Sun than ours. And as to Obliquity, you see it was much less considerable in the respective parts of the Primitive Earth, than of the present. Wherefore these are to be consider'd but as secondary causes of Cold, in respect of the third, the total absence of the Sun in the night time. And where this happens to be long and tedious, there you must expect excess of Cold. Now in the primitive Earth there was no such thing, as long winter nights, but every where, a perpetual Equinox, or a perpetual Day. And consequently, there was no room or cause of excessive cold in any part of it. But on the contrary, the case is very different in the present Earth. For in our Climate, we have not the presence of the Sun, in the depth of Winter, half as long as he is absent. And towards the Poles they have nights that last several weeks or months together. And then 'tis, that the Cold rages, binds up the ground, freezes the Ocean, and makes those parts, more or less, uninhabitable. But where no such causes are, you need not fear any such effects.

Thus much to shew that there might be Rains, Waters, and Rivers, in the primigenial Earth, and towards the extreme parts of it, without any danger of freezing. But however, says the other part of the exception, *These Rivers would not be made in due time.* That's wholly according to the process you take; If you take a meer natural process, the Rivers could not flow throughout the Earth, all on a sudden: but you may accelerate that process, as much as you please, by a Divine Hand. As to this particular indeed of the Rivers, one would think there should be no occasion for their sudden flowing through the Earth: because mankind could not be suddenly propagated

C

through-

throughout the Earth. And if they did but lead the way, and prepare the ground, in every countrey, before mankind arrived there, that seems to be all that would be necessary upon their account. Neither can it be imagin'd, but that the Rivers would flow faster than mankind could follow; for 'tis probable, in the first hundred years, men did not reach an hundred miles from home, or from their first habitations: and we cannot suppose the defluxion of Water, upon any declivity, to be half so slow. As to the chanel of these Rivers, the manner of their progress, and other circumstances, Those things are set down fully enough in the 5th Chapter of the 2d Book of the *English Theory*, and it would be needless to repeat them here.

Gén. 1. 22.
& 22.

ch. 13.

But the Anti-theorist says, this flow production and propagation of Rivers is contrary to Scripture: Both because of the Rivers of Paradise, and also because Fishes were made the Sixth day. As to that of the Fishes, He must first prove that those were River-fishes; for the Scripture makes them Sea-fish, and instances in great Whales. But he says, (p. 113, 114.) it will appear in the sequel of his Discourse, that the Abyss could be no receptacle of fishes. To that sequel of his Discourse therefore we must refer the examination of this particular. Then as to Paradise, that was but one single spot of ground, according to the ordinary Hypothesis: which he seems to adhere to; and Rivers might be there as soon as he pleases, seeing its seat is not yet determin'd. But as for the Lands which they are said to traverse or encompass, that might be the work of time, when their chanel and courses were extended and settled. As they would be doubtless long before the time that *Moses* writ that description. But as to the *Rivers of Paradise*, it would be a long story to handle that dispute here. And 'tis fit the Authors should first agree amongst themselves, before we determine the original of its River, or Rivers.

C H A P. VI.

WE come now to the Deluge: where the great Exception is this, That according to the Theory, the Deluge would have come to pass, whether mankind had been degenerate or no. p. 124

We know mankind did degenerate, and 'tis a dangerous thing to argue upon false suppositions: and to tell what would have come to pass, in case such a thing had not come to pass. Suppose Adam had not sin'd, what would have become of the Messiah and the Dispensation of the Gospel? which yet is said to have been determin'd more early than the Deluge. Let the Anti-theorist answer himself this question, and he may answer his own. Eph. i. 4.
1 Pet. i. 20.
Apoc. 13. 8.

But to take a gentler instance, Suppose Adam had not eaten the forbidden fruit: How could He and all his Posterity have liv'd in Paradise? A few generations would have fill'd that place, and should the rest have been turn'd out into the wide World, without any sin or fault of theirs? You suppose the Ante-diluvian Heavens and Earth to have been the same with the present, and consequently subject to the same accidents and inconveniences. The action of the Sun would have been the same then, as now, according to your Hypothesis: The same excesses of heat and cold, in the several regions and climates: The same Vapours and Exhalations extracted out of the Earth: The same impurities and corruptions in the air: and, in consequence of these, the same external dispositions to Epidemical distempers. Besides, there would be the same storms and tempests at Sea, the same Earth-quakes and other desolations at Land. So that *had all the Sons and Daughters of men, to use the Ex-
cepter's elegant style, been as pure and bright, as they
could possibly have dropt out of the mint of Creation, They
should still have been subject to all these inconveni-
ences and calamities. If mankind had continued spot-
less and undegenerate till the Deluge, or for sixteen
hundred years, they might as well have continued so
for sixteen hundred more. And in a far less time,* p. 122.

according to their fruitfulness and multiplication, the whole face of the Earth would have been thick covered with inhabitants: every Continent and every Island, every Mountain and every Desert, and all the climates from Pole to Pole. But could naked innocency have liv'd happy in the frozen Zones! where Bears and Foxes can scarce subsist. In the midst of Snows and Ice, thick fogs, and more than Egyptian darkness, for some months together. Would all this have been a Paradise, or a Paradisiacal state, to these Virtuous Creatures? I think it would be more advisable for the Excepter, not to enter into such disputes, grounded only upon suppositions. God's providence is infallible, as his counsels are immutable.

p. 121.

But the Excepter further suggests, that the Theory does not allow a judicial and extraordinary Providence in bringing on the Deluge, as a punishment upon mankind. Which, I must needs say, is an untrue and uncharitable suggestion. As any one may see,

** Notandum vero, quamvis mundi veteris dissolutionem & rationes Diluvii secundum ordinem causarum naturalium explicemus, quod eo modo magis clare & distincte intelligantur; non ideo in poenam humani generis ordinatum fuisse diluvium, singulisque ipsius motibus praefuisse providentiam, insiciamur: imo in eo elucet maxime Sapientia divina, quod mundum naturalem morali ita coarctet, ut temperet, ut huius ingenio, illius ordo & dispositio semper respondeat: & amborum liberioris momentis, simul concurrant & una compleantur utriusque tempora & vicissitudines, ipse etiam Apostolus Petrus diluvii & excidii mundani causas naturales assignat, cum ait, &c.*

both in the Latin Theory * Chap. 6th. and in the English, in several places. So at the entrance upon the explication of the Deluge (Theor. p. 68.) are these words, *Let us then suppose, that at a time appointed by Divine Providence, and from causes made ready to do that great execution upon a sinful world, that this Abyss was open'd, and the frame of the Earth broke, &c.* And accordingly in the conclusion of that discourse about the Deluge, are these words,

(Theor. p. 105.) *In the mean time I do not know any more to be added in this part, unless it be to conclude with an advertisement to prevent any mistake or misconstruction, as if this Theory, by explaining the Deluge in a natural way, or by natural causes, did detract from the power of God, by which that GREAT JUDGMENT WAS BROUGHT UPON THE WORLD, IN A PROVIDENTIAL AND MIRACULOUS MANNER.* And in the three following Paragraphs, which conclude that Chapter, there is a full account given both

Theor. p.
106, 107,
108.

of

of an ordinary and extraordinary Providence, in reference to the Deluge, and other great revolutions of the Natural World.

But it is a weakness however to think, that, when a train is laid in Nature, and Methods concerted, for the execution of a Divine Judgment, therefore it is not *Providential*. God is the Author and Governor of the Natural World, as well as of the Moral: and He sees through the futuritions of both, and hath so dispos'd the one, as to serve him in his just Judgments upon the other. Which Method, as it is more to the honour of his Wisdom, so it is no way to the prejudice of his Power or Justice. And what the Excerpter suggests concerning Atheists, and their presum'd cavils at such an explication of the Deluge, is a thing only said at random and without grounds. On the contrary, so to represent the sense of Scripture, in natural things, as to make it unintelligible, and inconsistent with Science and Philosophick truth, is one great cause, in my opinion, that breeds and nourishes Atheism.

CHAP. VII.

THIS Chapter is about the places of Scripture; which are all edg'd in confirmation of the Theory. And chiefly concerning that remarkable Discourse in St. Peter, 2 Epist. 2. which treats of the difference of the Antediluvian World and the present World. That Discourse is so fully explain'd in the *Review of the Theory*, that I think it is plac'd beyond all exception. And the Animadverter here makes his exception only against the first words, *Λαγδάει ὃ αὐτὸς τὸτο διλογίας*. which we thus render, *For this they willingly are ignorant of*. But he generally renders it, *wilfully ignorant of*: and lays a great stress upon that word *wilfully*. But if he quarrel with the *English* Translation, in this particular, he must also fault the *Vulgate*, and *Beza*, and all others that I have yet met withal. And it had been very proper for him, in this case, to have given us some Instances or proofs, out of Scripture or Greek Authors, where this Phrase signifies a *wilful and obstinate*

Ver. 5:

nate ignorance. He says it must have been a wilful ignorance, otherwise it was not blameable: whereas St. Peter gives it a sharp reproof. I answer, There are many kinds and degrees of blameable ignorance, a contented ignorance, an ignorance from prejudices, from non-attendance, and want of due examination. These are all blameable in some degree, and all deserve some reproof; but it was not their ignorance that St. Peter chiefly reproves, but their deriding and *scoffing* at the Doctrine of the coming of our Saviour, and the Conflagration of the World. And therefore He calls them *Scoffers, walking after their own lusts.*

P. 137.

But the Excepter seems at length inclinable to render the foremention'd words, thus, *They are willingly mindless or forgetful.* And I believe the translation would be proper enough. And what gentler reproof can one give, than to say, you are *willing to forget* such an Argument or such a Consideration. Which implies little more than non-attention, or an inclination of the will towards the contrary opinion. We cannot tell what evidence or what Traditions they might have then concerning the Deluge, but we know they had the History of it by *Moses*, and all the marks in Nature, that we have now, of such a Dissolution. And They, that pretended to Philosophize upon the works of Nature and the immutability of them, might very well deserve that modest rebuke, That they were *willing to forget* the first Heavens and first Earth, and the destruction of them at the Deluge, when they talkt of an immutable state of Nature.

Theor. c. 1.

Neither is there any thing in all this, contrary to what the Theorist had said, concerning the Ancient Philosophers, That none of them ever invented or demonstrated from the Causes, the true state of the first Earth. This must be granted; But it is one thing to demonstrate from the Causes, or by way of Theory, and another thing to know at large: whether by Scripture, Tradition, or collection from effects. The mutability and changes of the World, which these Pseudo-Christians would not allow of, was a knowable thing, taking all the means which they might and ought to have attended to: At least, before

fore they should have proceeded so far as to reject the Christian doctrine concerning the future changes of the World, with scorn and derision. Which is the very thing the Apostle so much censur'd them for.

So much for what is said by the Excepter concerning this place of St. Peter. To all the rest he gives an easie answer, (in the Contents of this Chapter) viz. That they are *Figurative, and so not argumentative*. The places of Scripture upon which the Theory depends are stated distinctly and in order, in the REVIEW: and, to avoid repetitions, we must sometimes refer to that: particularly, as to two remarkable places, *Psal. 24. 2.* and *Psal. 136. 6.* concerning the *Foundation and Extension of the Earth upon the Seas*. Which the Excepter quickly dispatches by the help of a *Par-* Review, p. 29, &c.
ticle and a *Figure*. 77

The next He proceeds to, is, *Psal. 33. 7. He gathereth the waters of the Sea, as in a Bag: He layeth up the Abysses in store-houses.* But, he says, it should be render'd, as *on a heap*: which is the *English Translation*. Whether the Authorities produc'd, in this case, by the Theorist*, or by the Excepter, are more considerable, I leave the Reader to judge. But however, he cites another place, *Psal. 78. 13.* where the same word is us'd and apply'd to the Red-Sea, which could not be enclos'd as in a bag. Take whether Translation you please for this second place; it is no prejudice to the Theory, if you render it *on an heap*: for it was a thing done by Miracle. But the other place speaks of the ordinary posture and constitution of the waters, which is not *on a heap*, but in a level or spherical convexity with the rest of the Earth. This reason the Animadverter was not pleas'd to take notice of, tho' it be intimated in that same place of the Theory which he quotes. But that which I might complain of most, is his unfair citation of the next Paragraph of the Theory, which he applies peculiarly to this Text of *Psal. 33. 7.* whereas it belongs to all the Texts alledg'd out of the *Psalms*, and is a modest reflection upon the explication of them. As the Reader may plainly see, if he please to look the Theory, and compare it with his citation. Eng. Theor. p. 86.
p. 86.
Except. p. 146.
The

An Answer to the late Exceptions made against

p. 141.

The next place he attacks, is, *Job 26. 7. He stretches the North over the Tohu, or, as we render it, over the empty places: and hangeth the Earth upon nothing.* Here he says, *Job* did either accommodate himself to the vulgar, or else was a perfect *Platonist*. Methinks *Plato* should rather be a *Jobist*, if you will have them to imitate one another. Then he makes an Objection, and answers it himself: Concluding however, that *Job* could not but mean this of the present Earth, because in the next Verse he mentions *Clouds*. But how does it appear, that every thing that *Job* mentions in that Chapter, refers to the same time.

The next place, is, *Job 38. 4, 5, 6. Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the Earth, &c.* These eloquent expostulations of the Almighty, he applies all to the present Form of the Earth: where he says, there are the *Embossings of Mountains, the Enamelling of lesser Seas, the open-work of the vast Ocean, and the Fret-work of Rocks, &c.* These make a great noise, but they might all be apply'd to the ruins of an old Bridge, fallen into the water. Then he makes a large harangue in commendation of Mountains and of the present Form of the Earth: which, if you please, you may compare with the 10th. Chap. of the *Latin Theory*, and then make your judgment upon both.

p. 146.

But it is not enough for the Excepter to admire the beauty of Mountains, but he will make the Theorist to do so too, because he hath express'd himself much pleas'd with the sight of them. Can we be pleas'd with nothing in an object, but the beauty of it? does not the Theorist say there, in the very words cited by the Excepter, *Sæpe loci ipsius insolentia & spectaculorum novitas delectat magis quàm venustas in rebus notis & communibus.* We are pleas'd in looking upon the Ruins of a *Roman Amphitheater*, or a *Triumphal Arch*, tho' time have defac'd its beauty. A man may be pleas'd in looking upon a Monster, will you conclude therefore that he takes it for a beauty? There are many things in objects besides beauty, that may please: but he that hath not sense and judgment enough to see the difference of those cases, and whence the pleasure arises, it would be very tedious to beat it into him by multitude of words. After

The Theory of the Earth.

23

After his commendation of Mountains, he falls up-
on the commendation of Rain: making those Coun-
tries, that enjoy it, to be better water'd than by Ri-
vers; and consequently the present Earth better than
that Paradisiacal Earth describ'd by the Theorist.
And in this he says, he follows the rule of Scripture,
for these are his words. *And that these rules whereby
we measure the usefulness of this Earth, and shew it to
be more excellent than that of the Theory; are the most
true and proper rules: is manifest from God's making
use of the same, in a case not unlike: For he comparing
Egypt and Palestine, prefers the later before the former;
because in Egypt the Seed sown was watered with the
foot, as a Garden of herbs; but Palestine was a Land
of Hills and Valleys, and drank water of the rain of
Heaven, Deut. 11. 10, 11.*

p. 148.

Let this rest a while. In the mean time let us take
notice how unluckily it falls out for the Observator,
that a Country, that had no rain, should be compared
in Scripture, or joyn'd in privilege, with Paradise
it self, and the Garden of God. For so is this very
Ægypt, Gen. 13. 10. tho' it had no rain, but was wa-
ter'd by Rivers. The words of Scripture are these.
*And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain of For-
dan, that it was well watered every where, (before the
Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrha) even as the Garden
of the Lord, like the land of Ægypt.* The Plain of
Jordan you see is commended for its fruitfulness and
being well watered: and as the height of its com-
mendation, it is compar'd with *Ægypt*, and with the
Paradise of God. Now in *Ægypt* we know there was
little or no rain: and we read of none in Paradise:
but they were both water'd by Rivers. Therefore
the greatest commendation of a Land, for pleasure
and fertility, according to Scripture, is its being well
water'd with Rivers: which makes it like a paradise.
Surely then you cannot blame the Theorist, having
this authority besides all other reasons, for making
the *Paradisiacal Earth* to have been thus water'd.

Now let the Excepter consider how he will inter-
pret and apply his place in *Deuteronomy*, and make it
consistent with this in *Genesis*. Till I see a better Inter-

D

pretation,

pretation, I like this very well, tho' quite contrary to his: Namely, *That* they were not to expect such a Land as *Aegypt*, that was a Plain naturally fruitfull, as being well water'd; But the Land they were to possess, depended upon the benediction of Heaven: And therefore they might expect more or less fertility, according as they kept God's Commandments. And so much for those two texts of Scripture.

p. 149.

Lastly, The Excepter in the conclusion of his discourse about that place in *Job*, makes a reflection upon the impropriety of those expressions in *Job*, about *Foundations* and *Corner-stones*, if they be apply'd to the first Earth describ'd by the Theorist. But this seems to me an Elegancy in that discourse, which he makes a fault: whether it be understood as an Allusion only to our manner of building, by deep Foundations, and strong Corner-stones: Or an Ironical interrogation, as it seems to me; implying, that there was no Foundation, (strictly so call'd) not Corner-stone, in that great Work, tho' we cannot build a cottage or little bridge without such preparations.

He proceeds then to the following verses in that 38th chap. *Who shut up the Sea with doors, when it broke forth as if it had issued out of a Womb?* This the Theorist understands of the *Disruption* of the *Abyss* at the Deluge, when the Sea broke forth out of the womb of the Earth: or out of that subterraneous cavity, where it was enclosed as in a womb. 'Tis plainly imply'd in the words of the Text, That the Sea was shut up in some *Womb*, before it broke forth. I desire therefore to know in what *Womb* that was. You will find Interpreters much at a loss to give a fair answer to that question: What was that inclos'd state of the Sea? and what place, or part of Nature, was that *Receptacle* where it lay? But the Excepter hath found out a new answer. He says it was that *Womb* of non-entity. These are his words, *It just then (at its creation) gush'd out of the womb of nothing, into existence.* This is a subtle and far-fetcht notion. Methinks the *Womb of nothing*, is much what the same as *no Womb*. And so this is no answer. But however let us consider

der how far it would suit this case, if it was admitted. If you understand the *Womb of Non-entity*, the Gen. 1. 2. Sea broke out of that womb the first day, and had no bars or doors set to it, but flow'd over all the Earth without check or controul. Therefore that could not be the time or state here spoken of. And to refer that restraint, or those bars and doors, to another time, which are spoken of here in the same verse, would be very inexcusable in the Excepter: Seeing he will not allow the Theorist to suppose those things that are spoken of in different verses, to be understood of different times. To conclude, this Metaphysical notion of the *Womb of nothing*, is altogether impertinent, at least in this case: For the Text is plainly speaking of things Local and Corporeal, and this prison of the Sea must be understood as such. p. 150.

He proceeds now to the last place alledg'd, *Prov. 8. 27, 28. When he prepared the Heavens, I was there: when he set a Compass upon the face of the deep.* The word *an* which we render *compass*, he says, signifies no more than the rotundity or spherical figure of the Abyss. And so the sence will run thus, *When God set a rotundity, or spherical figure, upon the face of the Abyss.* But whereas the word may as well signify a *Sphere* or *Orb*, the Theorist thinks it more reasonable that it should be so translated: and so the sentence would run thus, *When God set an Orb upon the face of the Deep.* And this discourse of Solomon's, referring to the beginning of the World, he thinks it rational to understand it of the *first habitable Earth*: which was really an *Orb set over the face of the Deep.*

One cannot swear for the signification of a word in every particular place, where it occurs: but when there are two senses whereof it is capable, and the one is much more important than the other, it is a fair presumption to take it in the more important sense; especially in such a place, and upon such an occasion, where the great works of the Divine Wisdom and Power are celebrated: as they are here by Solomon. And it cannot be deny'd, that our sense of the words is more important than the other: For of what consequence is it to say, *God made the*

Body of the Abyss round. Every one knows that Fluids of their own accord run into that figure. So as that would be a small remark upon a great occasion.

The construction of this Orb we speak of, minds me of an injustice which the Excepter hath done the Theory, in the precedent part of this Chapter, by a false accusation. For he says, The Theory makes the construction of the first Earth to have been *meerly Mechanical*. At least his words seem to signify as much, which are these. *And so its Formation, speaking of the first Earth, had been meerly Mechanical, as the Theory makes it.* That the construction was not meerly Mechanical, in the opinion of the Theorist, you may see, *Eng. Theor. p. 65.* which, because we have cited it before, we will not here repeat. The Theorist might also complain that the Excepter cites the first Edition of the Theory for such things as are left out in the second: which yet was printed a twelve-month before his Animadversions. And therefore in fairness he ought always to have consulted the last Edition and last sense of the Author, before he had censured him or his work. But this unfair method, it seems, pleas'd his humour better: as you may see in this Chapter, (*p. 154.*) and in several other places; where passages are cited and insisted upon, that are no where to be found in the second Edition. Not to mention his defective citations; omitting that part that qualifies the sentence, as *p. 99.* last citation, and else-where. I make this note that the Reader may judge, how well this answers that *sincerity*, with which he professes he would examine this work. *Only as a friend and servant to Truth. And therefore with such Candour, Meekness and Modesty, as becomes one who assumes and glories in so fair a Character, p. 43.*

The rest of this Chapter is a general Censure of citations out of Scripture, that are only Tropical or Figurative Scheams of Speech. These must be made so indeed, if our sense of them be not allow'd. But what necessity is there of a figurative interpretation of all these Texts? The rule we go by, and I think all good Interpreters, is this, That we are not to leave the literal sense, unless there be a necessity from

p. 81.
p. 100.
last part.
p. 154.
p. 227, 228.
p. 244.
p. 279, 280.
p. 288.

from the subject matter. And there is no such necessity in this case, upon our Hypothesis: for it suits with the literal sence. And 'tis to beg the Question, to say the literal sence is not to be admitted, because it complies too much with the Theory. But as for that Text of his own, which he instances in, the *Pillars of the Earth tremble*, that cannot be understood (by the same Rule) of Pillars *literally*; because there are no such Pillars of the Earth, upon any Hypothesis.

C H A P. VIII.

THIS Chapter is concerning that grand property of the Antediluvian Earth, a *perpetual Equinox*, or a Right position to the Sun. This perpetual Equinox the Excepter will by no means admit. But I'me afraid he mistakes the notion: for as he explains it in the two first Sections of this Chapter, he seems to have a false Idea of the whole matter. He thinks, I perceive, that when the Earth chang'd its situation, it was translated from the Equator into the Ecliptick: and that before that change, in the Antediluvian state, it mov'd directly under the Equator. For these are his words, *So that in her Annual motion about the Sun, namely, the Earth before that change, she was carried directly under the Equinoctial: without any manner of obliquity in her site, or declination towards either of the Tropicks, in her course; And therefore could never cut the Equinoctial, by passing (as now she is presum'd to do) from one Tropick to the other.* By which words, you see, he imagines that the Earth mov'd perpetually under the Equator, when it had a perpetual Equinox. And when it came out of that state, into this wherein it is now, it did not only change its position, and the posture of its Axis, but was also really translated from one part of the Heavens into Another: namely, from under the Equator to the Ecliptick, and so took another road in its annual course about the Sun. This is a great mistake: And I cannot blame him, if he was so averse to admit this change, seeing it lay so cross in his imagination. For what Pullies or Leavers should we employ

p. 158.

Lat. Theor.
li. 2. c. 4.

ploy to remove the Earth out of the Equator into the Ecliptick? *Archimedes* pretended, if he had ground to plant his Engines upon, that he would move the Earth out of its place; but that it was done before, I never knew, nor heard of: And if the Excepter had consider'd what is said in the Theory upon that occasion, he might easily have prevented his mistake. But we shall meet with the same Errour again in another place; Let us consider now what Arguments he uses against this change.

p. 159.

He says, *If there had been such a change*, either Providence or Mankind would have preserv'd the memory of it. How far the memory of it hath been preserv'd, we shall see hereafter. In the mean time, we will give him instances of other things to reflect upon, that are lost out of memory, unless he be the happy Man that shall retrieve them. The *Age of the World* hath not been preserv'd, either by the memory of Man, or by the care of Providence. And was not that both a thing of importance, and of easie preservation? *Noah* could not but know the Age of the World, for he was contemporary with five or six Generations, that were contemporary with *Adam*. And knowing the Age of the World himself, he could not easily forbear, one would think, to tell it to his Sons and Posterity. But to this day, we do not know what the true Age of the World is. There are three Bibles, if I may so say, or three *Pentateuchs*, the *Hebrew*, *Samaritan*, and *Greek*: which do all differ very considerably in their accounts, concerning the Age of the World: and the most Learned men are not yet able to determine with certainty, which of the three accounts is most authentick. Then, what think you of the place of *Paradise*? How well is the memory or knowledge of that preserv'd? Could *Noah* be ignorant of it: and was it not a fit subject to discourse of, and entertain his Sons and Nephews, and by them to communicate it to Posterity? Yet we seek it still in vain. The *Jews* were as much at a loss as we are: and the Christian Fathers, you think, were out in their opinions, both about the place and conditions of it: neither do you venture to determine them your self:

p. 163, 264,
265.

so

so that Paradise is lost in a manner out of the world. What wonder then if this single property of it be lost? If the Excepter had well consider'd what the Theorist Eng. Theor. p. 286, 287. has said concerning the Providential conduct of knowledge in the World, this doubt or objection might have been spar'd.

After a long excursion, little to the purpose, but to show his reading: He tells us next, that Scripture does not favour this notion of a perpetual Equinox before the Flood: And cites *Gen. 8. 22.* which the Theorist had cited as a place that did suggest to us that vicissitude of Seasons that was establish'd after the Flood. The words indeed are not so determinate in themselves, but that they may be understood, either of the restauration of a former order in the Seasons of the Year, or of the establishment of a new one. And in whether sense they are to be taken, is to be determin'd by collateral Reasons and Considerations. Such the Theorist had set down, to make it probable, that they ought to be understood as a Declaration of such an Order for the Seasons of the Year, as was brought in at that time, and was to continue to the end of the World. The Excepter hath not thought fit to take notice of, or refute, those Reasons, and therefore they stand good, as formerly. Besides, the Excepter must remember that this Text stands betwixt two remarkable Phænomena, the Longevity of the Antediluvians in the old World, and the appearance of the Rainbow in the New. Both which were marks of a different state of nature in the two Worlds.

He further excepts against that perpetual Equinox before the Flood, for another Scripture-reason: *Viz.* Because the Earth was curst before that time, and consequently, he says, had not a perpetual Equinox. But if that curse was supernatural, it might have its effect in any position of the Earth. For God can make a Land barren, if he think fit, in spite of the course of Nature. And so he also must suppose it to have been in this case. For, upon all suppositions, whether of a perpetual Equinox, or no, the Earth is granted to have been very fruitful at first: and so would have continued, if that curse had not interven'd.

Lastly,

An Answer to the late Exceptions made against

p. 169.

Lastly, He makes that an argument, that the Air was cold and intemperate in Paradise, and consequently no constant Equinox, *because Adam and Eve made themselves Aprons to cover their nakedness.* So, he confesses, Interpreters generally understand that it was to *cover their nakedness.* But he will not allow that to be the true sense, but says those Fig-leaves were to keep them warm. And the other Interpretation of *covering their nakedness,* he will not admit, for three reasons. First because the Scripture, as he pretends, does not declare it so. See, pray, *Gen. 3. 7.* Secondly, *What shame,* says he, *need there have been betwixt Husband and Wife?* Thirdly, *If it was modesty; when they were innocent, they should have been more modest.* Some arguments answer themselves, and I do not think these deserve a confutation. But, he says, however God made them *Coats of Skins* afterwards, and that was to be a *defence against cold.* He must tell us in what Climate he supposes Paradise to have stood: and which way, and how far, *Adam and Eve* were banisht from it. When those things are determin'd, we shall know what to judge of his argument, and of *Coats of Skins.*

p. 170.

After *Lastly,* I expected no more: but he hath two or three reasons after the *Last.* As first, he says, upon our Hypothesis, one Hemisphere of the Globe must have been unpeopled: because the Torrid Zone was unpassable. And was not the Ocean as unpassable, upon your Hypothesis? How got they into *America?* and not only into *America,* but into all the Islands of the Earth, that are remote from Continents. Will you not allow us one Miracle, for your many? I'm sure the Theorist never excluded the Ministry of Angels? and They could as easily carry them thorough the Torrid Zone, as over the Ocean. But Secondly, he says, There could be no Rains, to make the Flood, if there was a perpetual Equinox. Were not those rains that made the Flood, extraordinary, and out of the course of Nature? you would give one angry words that should deny it. Besides, the *Flood-gates of Heaven* were open'd when the *Great Deep* was broken up, (*Gen. 7. 11.*) and no wonder the Disruption of the Earth should cause some extraordinary Commotions

p. 171.

Eng. Theor.
p. 99.

in the air: and either compress the vapours, or stop their usual course towards the Poles, and draw them down in streams upon several parts of the Earth. But the Excepter says, this could not be, because the Theorist makes the rains fall before the disruption of the Abyss. But he does not suppose the *Cataracts of Heaven* to have been open'd before, which made the grand rains. And how unfairly that passage of the Theory is represented, we shall see hereafter in the 14th. Chapter.

Lastly, He concludes all with this remark: That all sorts of Authors have disputed, in what season of the Year the Deluge came, and in what season of the Year the World began: therefore they thought there were then different seasons of the Year. These disputes, he confesses, did *manifestly proceed from inadvertency*, or something worse: Because there could not be any one season throughout all the Earth at once. He might have added, unless upon the supposition of the Theory, which makes an universal Equinox at that time. And why may not that have given occasion to the general belief, *that the world begun in the Spring?* and when the true reason of the Tradition was lost, they fell into those impertinent questions, *In what season of the Year the World began.* But however we do not depend upon the belief, either of the Ancients or the Moderns, as to the generality: for we know they had other notions of these things than what the Theory proposes; otherwise it would have been a needless work. But notwithstanding the general error, that Providence did preserve some Traditions and Testimonies concerning that ancient Truth, we shall see in the next following discourse.

So much for Scripture and Reasons. He now comes to examine Authorities: Namely such Testimonies as are alledg'd by the Theorist, to shew that there was a Tradition amongst the Ancients, of a *change that had been, as to the position of the Earth:* and consequently, as to the form and seasons of the Year. The first Testimony that he excepts against is that of *Diogenes and Anaxagoras*; who witness plainly, That there had been an *Inclination* of the Earth, or a

change of posture, since it was form'd and inhabited. But the Excepter says they have not assign'd a true *final cause*, nor such as agrees with the Theory. The second Testimony is that of *Empedocles*, which he excepts against, because he hath not given a good *Efficient Cause* of that change. The third witness is *Leucippus*: against whom he makes the same exception, that he does not assign the Causes a-right. The fourth witness is *Democritus*: whom he quarrels upon the same account. But is this a fair hearing of Witnesses? Or are these just and legal grounds of rejecting their testimony, as to matter of Fact, because they are unskilful in giving the causes and reasons of that matter of Fact? That is not requir'd in witnesses: and they are often impertinent when they attempt to do it. The Theorist does not cite these Authors to learn of them the causes either Efficient or Final, of that *Inclination*, or change of posture in the Earth, but only matter of Fact. To let you see, that, according to their testimony, there was a Tradition in that time, which they took for true, concerning a change made in the posture of the Earth. And this is all we require from them. If you pretend to invalidate their testimony, because they do not Philosophize well about that change: That's as if you should deny that there was such a War as the *Peloponnesian* war, because the Historian hath not assigned the true causes and reasons of it. Or as if a man should give you the history of a Comet, that appear'd in such a year, was of such a form, and took such a course in the Heavens; and you should deny there was any such Comet, because the same Author had not given a good account of the generation of that Comet, nor of the Causes of its form and motion. The exceptions made against the testimonies of these Philosophers, seem to me to be no less injudicious.

p. 181.

After these Testimonies, He makes three or four remarks or reflections upon them. But they all concern, either the time of this Change, or the Causes of it. Neither of which the Theorist either engag'd or intended to prove from these Witnesses.

There

The Theory of the Earth.

33

p. 182.

There is still one Testimony behind, which the Excepter hath separated from the rest, that he might encounter it singly. 'Tis another passage from *Anaxagoras*, which both notes this *Inclination*, and the posture of the Heavens and Earth before that Inclination. But here the Excepter quarrels, first, with the word *δολοειδῶς*: because *Ambrosius* the Monk, would have it to be *δολερῶς*: but without the Authority of any Manuscript: and, as *Casaubon* says, *malé*. Then, he says, *Aldobrandinus* translates it *turbulentè*, but gives no reason for that translation, in his notes. Therefore he cannot rest in this, but in the third place, he gives another sense to *φορὰ δολοειδῆς*. And if that will not please you, he has still a fourth answer in reserve. I do not like when a man shifts answers so often, 'tis a sign he has no great confidence in any one. But let us have his fourth answer, 'Tis this, That *Anaxagoras* was a kind of heterodox Philosopher, and what he says is not much to be heeded. These are the words of the Excepter. *If this will not satisfy, I have one thing more to offer. Grant that Anaxagoras should mean that very Declination, which the Theory would have him, yet this truly would contribute little towards the proof of the thing. For he was a man as like to be Heterodox, as like to broach and maintain false and groundless opinions, as any of the learned Ancients. Had he made this exception against this witness at first, it might have sav'd both himself and us a great deal of pains. For we do allow, if you can prove a witness to be persona infamis, or non compos mentis, 'tis sufficient to invalidate his Testimony.*

p. 184.

But this is a rude and groundless censure; Shall that famous *Anaxagoras*, that was call'd *MENS*, κατ' ἐξοχῶς, not be thought so much as *mentis compos*? nor have credit enough for an honest witness? I am apt to think, from those sentences, and those remains we have left of him, that there was not a more considerable man amongst the Ancients, for nobleness of mind and natural knowledg. I could bring the testimonies of many ancient Authors, and of many Christian fathers, to clear his reputation, and place it above envy. 'Tis generally acknowledg'd, that he first introduc'd

Præp. Evan.
l. 10. c. ult.
p. 504. Col.

cb. 14 p. 750.

an intellectual principle, in the formation of the Universe: to dispose and order confus'd matter. And accordingly *Eusebius* gives him this fair character, *ἔτι δὲ πρῶτον διήρπρωσε, &c.* He first rectified the doctrine of Principles: For he did not only discourse about the matter or substance of the Universe, as other Philosophers: but also of the cause and principle of its motion. And the same Author, in his 14th Book, repeats and enlarges this character.

Strom. 2. p.
364.
Phæd. p. 99.

Strom. 2. p.
416.

I wonder, the Excepter, of all men, should lessen the name of *Anaxagoras*. For, besides his Orthodoxy as to the intellectual World: He was one that establish'd the notion of *Vortices*, in the Corporeal. As you may see in *Clem. Alexandrinus*, and in *Plato's Phædo*. And tho' the *Father*, and *Socrates*, (who never was a friend to natural Philosophy) both blame him for it; yet the excepter, who is deservedly pleas'd with that Systeme of *Vortices*, ought to have shew'd him some favour and esteem for the sake of this doctrine. Lastly, as to his moral temper; his contempt of the World, and his love of contemplation; you have many instances of it in the short story of his life in *Laertius*. And I shall always remember that excellent saying of his in *Clem. Alexandrinus*, *Τὴν δεινότητα τῷ βίῳ τέλει δὲ ἀπὸ ταύτης ἐλευθερίαν*, That the end of life is Contemplation; and that liberty, that accompanies it, or flows from it.

But we are not to imagine, that all the opinions of the ancient Philosophers, are truly conveyed or represented to us. Neither can we in reason or justice believe, that they could be guilty of such absurd notions, as are sometimes fathered upon them. The Excepter instances in an extravagant assertion, (as the story is told to us) ascrib'd to *Anaxagoras*: of a stone that fell from the Sun. This cannot be literally true, nor literally the opinion of *Anaxagoras*, if he believ'd *Vortices*; therefore methinks so witty a man as the Excepter, and so well vers'd in the modern Philosophy, should rather interpret this of the Incrustation of a fixt Star, and its descent into the lower World: That a Star fell from the Ethereal regions, and became an Opaque and Terrestrial Body. Especially seeing *Diogenes*,

as

as he says, supposes it a Star. Some things were anigmatically spoken at first: and some things afterwards so much corrupted, in passing thorough unskilful hands, that we should be very injurious to the memory of those great Men, if we should suppose every thing to have come so crudely from them, as it is now deliver'd to us. And as to this Philosopher in particular; As the *Ionick* Physiology, in my opinion, was the most considerable amongst the Ancients; so there was none, of that order, more considerable than *Anaxagoras*. Whom, tho' you should suppose extravagant, *quoad hoc*, that would not invalidate his testimony in other things.

Upon the whole matter, let us now summ up the Evidence, and see what it will amount to. Here are five or six Testimonies of considerable Philosophers: *Anaxagoras*, *Diogenes*, *Empedocles*, *Leucippus* and *Democritus*. To which he might have added *Plato*, both in his *Politicus* and *Phædo*, if he had pleas'd to have lookt *Li. 2. c. 10.*
p. 274. into the 2d. Edition of the *Latin* Theory. These Philosophers do all make mention of a change that hath been in the posture of the Earth and the Heavens. And tho' they differ in assigning causes, or other circumstances, yet they all agree as to matter of Fact: that there was such a thing, or, at least, a Tradition of such a thing. And this is all that the Defendant desir'd or intended to prove from them, as Witnesses in this cause.

To these *Philosophers*, he might have added the Testimonies of the *Poets*, who may be admitted as witnesses of a Tradition, though it be further questioned, whether that Tradition be true or false. These Poets when they speak of a *Golden Age*, or the *Reign of Saturn*, tell us of a *perpetual Spring*, or a Year without change of Seasons. This is expressly said by *Ovid*, *Ver erat Æternum*, &c. And upon the expiration of the Golden Age, he says,

*Jupiter Antiqui contraxit tempora Veris,
Perque Hyemes, Æstusque, & inæquales Autumnos,
Et breve Ver, spatiis exegit quattuor annum.*

Ovid

Ovid liv'd in the time of our Saviour. And the Tradition, it seems, was then a foot, and very express too. *Plato*, who was much more ancient, hath said the same thing, in his *Politicus*, concerning the *Reign of Saturn*. And if we may have any regard to *Mythology*, and make *Janus* the same with *Noah*, which is now an Opinion generally receiv'd: That power that is given him by the Ancients, of *changing Times and Seasons*, cannot be better expounded, than by that great change of time, and of the Seasons of the Year, that happen'd in the Days of *Noah*. Neither must we count it a meer Fable, what is said by the Ancients, concerning the Inhabitability of the *Torrid Zone*: and yet that never was, if the Earth was never in any other posture, than what it is in now.

Lastly, As the Philosophers and Poets are witnesses of this Tradition, so many of the Christian Fathers have given such a Character of *Paradise*, as cannot be

understood upon any other supposition, than of a *Perpetual Equinox*. This *Card. Bellarmine* * hath noted to our hands; and also observ'd, that there could not be a perpetual Equinox in the Countries of *Asia*, nor indeed in any Topical Paradise, (unless it stood in the middle of the *Torrid Zone*) *nisi alius tunc fuerit cursus solis, quàm nunc est; unless the course of the Sun*, or, which is all one,

the posture of the Earth, was otherwise at that time, than what it is now: which is a true observation. The *Jewish* Doctors also, as well as the Christian, seem to go upon the same supposition, when they place Paradise under the Equinoctial; Because they suppos'd it certain, as *Aben Ezra* tells us, that the Days and Nights were always equal in Paradise.

We have now done with the examination of Witnesses: *Philosophers, Poets, Jews, and Christians*. From all these we collect, That there was an opinion, or Tradition, amongst the Ancients, of a change made in the state of the Natural World, as to the diversity of Seasons in the Year: And that this did arise from the change

Vid. Theor.
Nat. li. 2.
c. 10. in fine.

* De Grat. prim. hom. c. 12.
Accedit ad hæc. quod Paradisus ita describitur à Sancto Basilio, in Libro de Paradiso; à Joan. Damasceno Libro secundo, de fide, capite undecimo; à Sancto Augustino libro decimo quarto de civitate Dei, capit. 10. Ab Alchimio, Avito, & Claud. Mario victore, & aliis supra citatis. Isidoro libro decimo quarto Etymolog. capite tertio, & aliis communiter; ut fuerit in eo ver perpetuum, nulla frigora, nulli aestus, nulla pluvie, nives, grandines, nulle etiam nubes; quod ipsum significat scriptura, cum dicit primos homines in Paradiso fuisse nudos.

See Eng.
Theor.
p. 253.

change of the posture of the Earth. Whether this Opinion, or this Tradition, was *de jure*, as well as *de facto*, is a question of another nature, that did not lie before us at present. But the thing that was only in debate in this Chapter, was matter of Fact, which I think we have sufficiently prov'd.

In the close of this Chapter, The Excepter makes two Queries: still by way of objection to the Antediluvian Equinox. The First is this, *Supposing an Equinox in the beginning of the World, would it (in likelihood) have continued to the Flood.* If you grant the first part, I believe few will scruple the second. For why should we suppose a change before there appear any cause for it. He says, the Waters might possibly have weigh'd more towards one Pole, than towards another. But why the Waters more than the Air? The Waters were not more rarified towards one Pole, than towards another, no more than the Air was: for which the Excepter had justly blam'd *Leucippus* before. But however, *says He*, that Earth would be very unstable, because, in process of time, there would be an empty space betwixt the Exterior Region of the Earth, and the Abyss below. But that empty space would be fill'd with such gross vapors, that it would be little purer than water: and would stick to the Earth much closer than its Atmosphere that is carried about with it. We have no reason to change the posture of the Earth, till we see some antecedent change that may be a cause of it. And we see not any, till the Earth broke. But then indeed, whether its posture depended barely upon its *Æquilibrium*, or upon its *magnetisme*, either, or both of them, when its parts were thrown into another situation, might be chang'd. For the parts of a ruine seldom lie in the same libration the Fabrick stood in. And as to the magnetisme of the Earth, that would change, according as the Parts, and Regions of the Earth chang'd their situation.

The second Query is this. Granting there was such an Equinox in the first World, *Would not the natural day, towards the later end of that World, have been longer, than in the former periods of the same.* Suppose this was true,

p. 188.

true, which yet we have no reason to believe, That the Days were longer towards the flood, than towards the beginning of the World: why is this contrary to Scripture? He tells you how, in these words. *That the days just before the flood were of no unusual length, is evident in the very story of the Flood; the duration of which we find computed by Months, consisting of thirty days a-piece. Whereas had days been grown longer, fewer of them would have made a Month.* This is a meer Paralogisme, or a meer blunder. For if thirty days were to go to a Month, whether the days were longer or shorter, there must be thirty of them; and the Scripture does not determine the length of the days. If thirty circumgyrations of the Earth make a Month, whether these circumgyrations are slow or swift, thirty are still thirty. But I suppose that which he would have said, and which he had confusedly in his mind, was this, That the *Month* would have been longer at the Flood than it was before. *Longer*, I say, as to extent of time, or duration in general, but not as to number of days. And you could not cut off a slip of one day, and tack it to the next, through the intermediate Night, to make an abridgment of the whole. Therefore this Objection is grounded upon a mistake, and ill reasoning, which is now sufficiently detected.

CHAP. IX.

p. 189.

THIS Chapter is against the *Oval Figure of the first Earth*: which the Theorist had asserted, and grounded upon a general motion of the Waters, forc'd from the Equinoctial Parts towards the Polar. But before we proceed to his Objections against this Explication, we must rectifie one Principle. The Excepter seems to suppose, that Terrestrial Bodies have a *nitency inwards or downwards, towards their Central point.* Whereas the Theorist supposes, that all Bodies moving round, have, more or less, a nitency from the Center of their motion: and that 'tis by an external force that they are prest down, against their first inclination or nitency.

p. 190.

This

This being premis'd, we proceed to his exceptions: where his first and grand quarrel is about the use of a word: whether the motion of the Water from the middle of the Earth towards the Poles, can be call'd *defluxus*. Seeing those Polar Parts, in this suppos'd case, were as high, or higher than the Equinoctial. I think we do not scruple to say, *undæ defluunt ad litora*: tho' the shores be as high, or higher than the Surface of the Sea. For we often respect, as the Theorist did, the *middle* and the *fides*, in the use of that word: And so, *defluere è medio ad latera*, is no more than *prolabi ad latera*. But 'tis not worth the while to contest about a word. Especially seeing 'tis explain'd in the 2d. Edition of the Theory, by adding *detrusione*: but it would have spoil'd all this pedantry, and all his little triumphs, if he had taken notice of that Explication.

p. 186.

Wherefore setting aside the word, Let us consider his reasons against this motion of the Waters towards the Poles: which, he says, could not be, because it would have been an ascent; not a descent. We allow and suppose that. But may not Waters ascend by force and detrusion: when it is the easiest way they can take to free themselves from that force, and persevere in their motion? And this is the case we are speaking to. They were impell'd to ascend, or recide from the Center, and it was easier for them to ascend laterally, than to ascend directly: upon an inclin'd Plain, than upon a perpendicular one. Why then should we not suppose that they took that course? Methinks the Observator, who seems to be much conversant in the *Cartesian* Philosophy, might have conceiv'd this detrusion of the Waters towards the Poles by the resistance of the superambient Air, as well as their flowing towards and upon the shores, by the pressure of the Air under the Moon. And if the Moon continued always in the same place, or over the middle of the Sea, that posture of the waters would be always the same: though it be an ascent, both upon the Land and into the Rivers. And this, methinks, is neither contradiction, nor absurdity. But an Enemy, that is little us'd to Victory, makes a great noise upon a small advantage.

F

He

An Answer to the late Exceptions made against

He proceeds now to show, that it was improbable that the Figure of the first Earth should be Oval, upon other considerations. As first, Because of its position: which would be cross to the stream of the Air, that turns it round, or carries it about the Sun. As a Ship, he says, that stands side-ways against a stream, cannot sail. But if that Ship was to turn round upon her Axis, as a Mill-wheel, and as the Earth does, what posture more likely to have such an effect, than to stand cross to the stream that turns it? And the stream would take more hold of an Oblong-Body, than of a round. Then, as to its annual course, which he mentions, that's nothing, but so many Circumvolutions: for in turning round it is also progressive, as a Cylinder in rowling a Garden. And three-hundred sixty-five circumgyrations compleat its annual course. So that this argument turns wholly against him, and does rather confirm the Oval Figure of the Earth.

His Second Argument against the Oval Figure of the First Earth, is the Spherical Figure of the present Earth. And how does he prove that? First from Authorities: *Anaximander*, *Pythagoras*, and *Parmenides* thought so. But how does he prove that their asserting the Earth to be round, was not meant in opposition to its being Plain: as the *Epicureans*, and the Vulgar would have it? That was the Question *Socrates* promis'd himself to be resolv'd in by *Anaxagoras*, *πότερον ἢ γῆ πλατεῖα ἔστιν, ἢ σφαιρική*. Whether the Earth was flat, or round. And 'tis likely the dispute was generally understood in that sence. However the Theorist hath alledg'd many more Authorities than these, in favour of the Oval Figure of the Earth. For besides *Empedocles* in particular, and those whom *Plutarch* mentions in general, the Philosophy of *Orpheus*, the *Phœnician*, *Ægyptian*, and *Persian Philosophers* did all compare the Earth to an Egg: with respect to its Oval external form, as well as internal composition. These you may see fully set down in the *Theory*: And it had been fair in the Excepter to have taken some notice of them, if he would contend in that way of Authorities. But he has thought fit rather to pass them over wholly in silence.

His

*Plat. in
Phad.*

*Lat. Theor.
li. 2. c. 10.*

His reasons to prove the figure of the present Earth to be Spherical and not Oval, are taken, first, from the Conical figure, of the shadow of the Earth, cast upon the Moon. But that cannot make a difference, sensible to us at this distance, whether the Body that cast the shadow was exactly Spherical or Oval. His Second reason is *from the place of the waters*: which, he says, would all retire from the Poles to the Equator, if the Polar parts were higher. But this has been answer'd before. The same cause that drive the Waters thither, would make them keep there. As we should have a perpetual Flood, if the Moon was always in our Meridian. And whereas he suggests, that by this means the Sea should be shallowest under the Poles: which, he says, is against experience. We tell him just the contrary, That, according to our Hypothesis, the Sea should be deepest towards the Poles; which agrees with experience. That the Sea should be deepest under the Poles, if it was of an Oval form, he may see plainly by his own Scheme, or by the Theory Scheme: So that if his observation be true, of an extraordinary depth of the Ocean in those parts, it confirms our suspicion, that the Sea continues still Oval. Lastly, he urges, If this Earth was Oval, Navigation towards the Poles would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, because upon an ascent. But if there be a continual draught of Waters from the Equator towards the Poles, this will balance the difficulty, and be Equivalent to a gentle Tide, that carries Ships into the mouth of a River, though upon a gradual ascent.

p. 186.

Theor. Lat.
li. 2. c. 5.

p. 198.

Thus much we have said in complacency to the Excepter. For the Theorist was not oblig'd to say any thing, in defence of the Oval form of the present Earth, seeing he had no where asserted it. It not being possible, as to what evidence we have yet, to determine in what order the Earth fell, and in what posture the ruins lay after their fall. But however, to speak my mind freely upon this occasion, I am inclinable to believe, that the Earth is still Oval or Oblong. What things the Antitheorist hath suggested, will not decide the controversy: nor, it may be, any natural history.

nor any of those observations, that we have already. The surface of the Sea lies more regular than that of the Land, and therefore I should think, that observations made there, would have the best effect. I should particularly recommend these two: First, that they would observe towards the Poles, whether the Sun rise and set, according to the rules of a true Globe, or of a Body exactly Spherical. Secondly, that they would observe whether the degrees of latitude are of equal extent in all the parts of a Meridian; that is, if the quantity of sea or land that answers to a degree in the heavens, be of equal extent towards the Equator as towards the Poles. These two observations would go the nearest of any, I know, to determine whether the figure of the Earth be truly spherical or oblong.

CHAP. X.

p. 201.

THIS Chapter is concerning the *Original of Mountains*, and that they were before the Flood, or from the beginning. Which the Excepter endeavours to prove from Scripture: not directly, but because mention is made of them in the same places where the beginning of the Earth is mentioned, as *Psal.* 96. 1, 2. and *Prov.* 8. 25: therefore they must be co-eval and contemporary. We have, I think, noted before, that things are not always Synchronal that are mention'd together in Scripture. The Style of Scripture is not so accurate, as not to speak of things in the same place, that are to be referr'd to different times. Otherwise we must suppose the destruction of *Jerusalem*, and of the *World*, to have been intended for the same time: seeing our Saviour joyns them in the same discourse, (*Matt.* 24.) without any distinction of time. Or with such a distinction, as rather signifies an immediate succession (*ver.* 29.) than so great a distance as we now find to be betwixt the destruction of *Jerusalem* and the end of the *World*. Greater than that, betwixt the Beginning and the Flood. So in the Prophets sometimes, in the same discourse, one part is to be referr'd to the first coming of our Saviour, and another

other part to the second: without making any distinction of time, but what is to be gathered from the fence. Neither is there any incongruity in the fence, or in the tenour of the words, if those expressions in the Psalmist be referr'd to different times. God existed *before the Mountains were brought forth, and the Earth and the World were made.* This is certainly true, whether you take it of the same or different times. And if you take it of different times, 'tis a way of speaking we often use. As suppose a man should say concerning the Antiquity of *Troy*, that it existed before *Rome* and *Carthage*, that does not necessarily imply, that *Rome* and *Carthage* were built at the same time; but only that *Troy* was before them both. And so this of the Psalmist may be very well thus exprest, by a gradation from a lower Epoque to an higher. Then as for that place in *Prov.ch.8.* It would be very hard to reduce all those things that are mentioned there, (from *ver. 22.* to the *30.*) to the same time of existence; and there is no necessity from the words that they should be so understood. The design and intention of the Holy Ghost is plain in both these places: In the one to set out the Eternity of God, and in the other, of the *Logos* in particular. And this is done by shewing their pre-existence to this Earth, and to all its greatest and most remarkable parts.

He mentions also, *Deut. 33. 15.* where the Hills are call'd *Lasting*, and the Mountains *Ancient.* And *therefore they were before the Flood.* This is a hard consequence. The River *Kisbon* is call'd the *ancient* River: *Judg. 5. 21.* but I do not therefore think it necessary, that that brook should have been before the Flood. Things may very well deserve that character of *Lasting* or *Ancient*, though they be of less antiquity than the Deluge. If one should say the *lasting Pyramids*, and *ancient Babylon*, none could blame the expression, nor yet think that they were therefore from the beginning of the World.

After these allegations from Scripture, He descends to a natural argument, taken from the *mountains in the Moon.* Which, he says, are much higher than the mountains upon the Earth: and therefore, seeing her Body

Isa. 9. 6, 7.
Isa. 9. 1, &c.
Luk. 1. 31,
32, 33.

p. 202.

p. 205.

Body is less, they could not be made by a Dissolution of that Planet, as these of the Earth are said to have been. Though we are not bound to answer for the Mountains in the Moon, yet however 'tis easie to see that this is no good argument. For, besides that the Orb there might be more thick, all ruines do not fall alike. They may fall double, or in ridges and arches, or in steep piles, some more than others, and so stand at a greater height. And we have reason to believe that those in the Moon fell otherwise than those of the Earth: because we do not see her turn round: nor can we ever get a sight of her back-side, that we might better judge of the shapes of her whole Body.

p. 206.

From this Natural Argument, he proceeds to an Historical Argument, taken from the *Talmudists* and *Josephus*. The *Talmudists* say, that *many Giants sav'd themselves from the Flood upon Mount Sion*. But this, the Excepter confesses, is *wholly fabulous*. What need it then be mention'd as an argument? Then he says, *Josephus* reports that *many sav'd themselves from the flood upon the mountain Baris in Armenia*. But this also, he says, is *false in the gross, and a formal fiction*. Why then, say I, is it brought in as an argument? Lastly, he quotes a passage out of *Plato*, who says, when the gods shall drown the Earth, the *Herdsmen and Shepherds shall save themselves upon mountains*. And this the Excepter calls a *piece of confus'd forgery*. Why then, say I still, is it alledg'd as an argument against the Theory? But however, says the Excepter, these things argue that many thought there were mountains before the Flood. But did the Theorist ever deny that it was the vulgar and common opinion? Therefore such allegations as these, may be of some use to shew reading, but of no effect at all to confute the Theory.

p. 207.

ibid.

p. 208.

Yet the Excepter is not content with these stories, but he must needs add a fourth. Which, he says, is a *plain intimation that there were mountains in the beginning of the World*. Take his own words for the story and the application of it. *I will only add that Traditional story which is told of Adam; namely, how that after his fall, and when he repented of his Sin, he bewailed it for several hundreds of years, upon the mountains of India.*

Another

Another plain intimation that THERE WERE MOUNTAINS in the beginning of the World. This is a plain intimation indeed, that those that made this Fable, thought there were mountains then: but is it a proof that there really was so? as you seem to infer. Does the Excepter really believe that *Adam* wander'd an hundred years upon the mountains of *India*? If the matter of fact be false, the supposition it proceeds upon may as well be false. And he does not so much as cite an Author here, for the one or the other.

We are now come to the main point, a new Hypothesis concerning the *original of Mountains*, which the Excepter hath vouchsafed to make for us. And in short, it is this. When the Waters were drain'd off the Land, on the 3^d day, while it was moist and full of Vapours, the *Sun* by his heat, made the Earth heave and rise up in many places, which thereupon became Mountains. But lest we mistake or misrepresent the Author's sence, we will give it in his own words. *Now the Earth by this collection of the waters into one place, being freed from the load and pressure of them, and laid open to the Sun; the moisture within, by the heat of his beams, might quickly be turn'd into Vapours. And these Vapours being still increased by the continued rarifying warmth from above, at length they wanted space wherein to expand or dilate themselves. And at last not enduring the confinement they felt, by degrees heaved up the Earth above; somewhat after the manner that leaven does Dough, when it is laid by a fire; but much more forcibly and unevenly. And lifting it up thus in numberless places, and in several quantities, and in various figures; Mountains were made of all shapes and sizes. Whose origine and properties, he says, upon this Hypothesis, will be obvious, or at least intelligible, to thinking and Philosophick Minds.*

p. 208,
209, &c.

p. 209.

I must confess I am none of those *Thinking and Philosophick Minds*, to whom this is either obvious or intelligible. For there seem to me, to be a great many palpable defects or oversights in this new Hypothesis. Whereof this is one of the grossest, that he supposes the *Sun*, by his heat, the 3^d Day to have rais'd these Mountains upon the Earth; whereas the *Sun* was not created

p. 51. the 4th.
day was the
first day of
the Sun's ex-
istence.

created till the 4th. Day. So that it had this powerful effect, it seems, one day before it came into Being.

p. 209.

But suppose the Sun had then existed: This is a prodigious effect for the Sun to perform, in so short a time, and with so little force. The greatest part of that Day was spent in draining the Waters from off the Land. Which had a long way to go, from some Inland Countries, to reach the Sea, or their common receptacle. And, he says, without an extraordinary power, *perhaps they could not have been drained off the Earth in one Day.* Let us then allow, at least, half a Day, for clearing the Ground; so the Sun might begin his work about Noon: And before Night, he had rais'd all the Mountains of one Hemisphere. It will require a strong Philosophick Faith, to believe this could be all done by the action of the Sun, and in so short a time. Besides we must consider, that the Sun, by Noon, had past all the Eastern Countries, yet cover'd with Water, or not well drain'd: So that after they were dry'd, he could only look back upon them, with faint and declining rayes. Yet the Mountains of the East are as great and considerable as else-where. But there is still another great difficulty in the case, as to the Northern and Southern Mountains of the Earth: for they lie quite out of the road of the Sun: being far remov'd towards either Pole; where, by reason of his distance and obliquity, his beams have little force. How would he heave up the *Riphaean* Mountains, those vast heaps of Stone and Earth, that lie so far to the North? You see what observations the Excepter hath made (p. 119, 120.) concerning the cold of those Countries: And it falls out very untowardly for this new Hypothesis, that the Northern parts of the Earth, as *Norway, Sweedland, Island, Scythia, Sarmathia, &c.* should be such Mountainous and Rocky Countries; where he had before declar'd the Sun had so little force. And indeed, according to his Scheme, all the great Mountains of the Earth should have been under the Equator, or, at least, betwixt the Tropicks.

But to examine a little the manner and method of this great Action: and what kind of Bodies these new Moun-

Mountains would be. Either the Sun drew up only the surface and outward skin of the Earth, as Cupping-glasses raise Blisters. Or his beams penetrated deep into the Earth, and heaved up the substance of it, as Moles cast up mole-hills. If you take the first method, these superficial Mountains would be nothing but so many baggs of Wind: and not at all answerable to those huge masses of Earth and stone, whereof our mountains consist. And if you take the second method, and suppose them pusht out of the solid Earth, and thrown up into the air, imagine then how deep these raies of the Sun must have penetrated in a few hours time, and what strength they must have had, to agitate the vapours to that degree, that they should be able to do such prodigies as these. Several Mountains, upon a moderate computation, are a mile high from the level of the Earth. So that it was necessary that the beams of the Sun should penetrate, at least, a mile deep, in so short a time: and there loosen and rarefie the vapours, and then tear up by the roots vast loads and extents of ground, and heave them a mile high into the open air; and all this in less than half a day. Such things surely are beyond all imagination: and so extravagant, that one cannot, in conscience, offer them to the belief of a man. Can we think that the Sun, who is two or three hours in licking up the Dew from the grass, in a *May-morning*: should be able, in as many more hours, to suck the *Alps* and *Pyreneans* out of the bowels of the Earth? And not to spend all his force upon them neither. For he would have as much work in other Countries. To raise up *Taurus*, for instance, and *Imaus*, and frozen *Caucasus* in *Asia*. And the mighty *Atlas* and the *Mountains* of the *Moon* in *Africk*. Besides the *Andes* in *America*, which, they say, far exceed all the Mountains of our Continent. One would be apt to think, that this Gentleman never see the face of a Mountainous Country. For he writes of them, as if he had taken his Idea of Mountains, and the great ridges of Mountains, upon the Earth, from the *Devil's Ditch*, and *Hogmagog Hills*. And he raises them faster than Mushromes, out of the ground. If the New-born Sun, at his first appearance,

could make such great havock, and so great changes, upon the face of the Earth, what hath he been doing ever since? we never heard, nor read, of a Mountain, since the memory of Man, rais'd by the heat of the Sun. We may therefore enquire in the last place,

Why have we no Mountains made now by the same causes? We have no reason to believe, that the heat or strength of the Sun is lessen'd since that time, why then does it not produce like effects? But I imagine he hath an answer for this. Namely, that the moisture of the first Earth, when it was new-drain'd and marshy, contributed much to this effect: which now its driness hinders. But besides, that the driness of the Earth should rather give an advantage, by the collection of Vapours within its Cavities: However we might expect, according to this reason, that all our drain'd Fenns and marshy grounds should presently be rais'd into Mountains. Whereas we see them all to continue arrand Plains, as they were before. But if you think these are too little spots of ground to receive a strong influence from the Sun, take *Ægypt* for an instance. That's capacious enough, and it's overflow'd every Year, and by that means made soft and moist to your mind, as the new Earth when it rise from under the Abyfs. Why then is not *Ægypt* converted into Mountains, after the inundation and retirement of *Nile*? I do not see any qualification wanting according to the Excepter's Hypothesis: *Ægypt* hath a moist Soil and a strong Sun; much stronger than the *Alpes* or *Pyreneans* have: and yet it continues one of the plainest Countries upon the Earth. But there is still a greater instance behind against this Hypothesis, than any of the former: And that is, of the whole Earth after the Deluge: when it had been overflow'd a second time by the Abyfs; upon the retirement of those Waters it would be much what in the same condition as to moisture, that it was in the 3^d. Day, when it first became dry Land. Why then should not the same effect follow again, by the heat of the Sun: And as many new Mountains be rais'd upon this second draining of the Earth, as upon the first? These are plain and obvious Instances, and as plainly

plainly unanswerable. And the whole Hypothesis, which this Vertuoso hath propos'd concerning the *Origine* of Mountains, is such an heap of Incredibilities, and things inconsistent one with another, that I'me afraid I shall be thought to have spent too much time in confutation of it.

In the conclusion of this Chapter, he hath an attempt to prove that there were Mountains before the Flood, *because there were Metals*: which are commonly found about the Roots of Mountains. But the Theorist, he says, to *shun this great inconvenience, fairly consents to the abolishing of metals out of the first state of nature*. Yet he's hard put to it, to prove that the Theorist hath any where asserted, whatsoever he thought, that there were no Metals then. The first Citation he produces, only recites the opinion of others, and says, he *thinks they do not want their reasons*. Of the two other Citations out of the Preface, the First does not reach home, making no mention of Metals. And the Second is wholly misconstrued, and perverted to a sence quite contrary to what the Author intended, or the Context will bear. But however the Theorist appears doubtful whether there were Metals, or no, in the First World: and upon this doubt the Excepter lays this heavy charge. *Thus the Fidelity of Moles is assaulted, and another intolerable affront put upon the HOLY GHOST*. For, do not both inform us, that the City Enoch was built, and the Ark prepared before the Flood? But how could either be done without Iron-tools? But does either Moses, or the Holy Ghost tell us, that there were Iron-tools, in building that City, or the Ark? If they do not, we onely affront the consequence, which the Excepter draws from the words, and not the Authors of them. By what divine authority does the Animadverter assert, that there was Iron, or Iron-tools, in building this City, or that Ark? I'me sure Scripture does not mention either, upon those occasions. And seeing it mentions onely *Gopher Wood* and *Pitch* for the building of the Ark, 'tis a presumption rather, that there were no other Materials us'd. And as to the City, 'tis true, if he fancy the City which *Enoch* built, to have been like *Paris*, or

p. 215.

p. 216.

p. 215. li. 24.

Gen. 6. 14.

London, he has reason to imagine, that they had Iron-tools to make it. But suppose it was a number of Cottages, made of Branches of Trees, of Osiers and

* *Per ludibrium rogant nasuti homines, unde Architectos & Opifices conduxerit Cain ad urbem extruendam; Nos vicissim ab illis quarimus, quo auctore credant Urbem ex quadratis lapidibus fuisse extructam: & magno artificio, multisque sumptibus, & longi temporis opera, adificium hoc constitisse. Nihil enim aliud colligere licet ex verbis Moysi, quam muros ex rudi materia, Cain sibi & posteris circumdedit. Cal. in loc.*

Bulrushes, (and what needed they any other House, when the Air was so temperate) or, if you will, * of Mud-walls, and a Roof of Straw: with a Fence about it to keep out Beasts: there would be no such necessity of Iron-tools. Consider, pray, how long the World was without knowing the use of Iron, in several

parts of it, as in the North, and in *America*: and yet they had Houses and Cities after their fashion. For the Northern Countries you may see *Olaus Magnus*, li. 12. c. 13. For *America*, *Pet. Martyr*, Dec. 1. But the Excepter will save you your pains, as to the *Indians*, for he says himself in another place, that they had no Instruments of Iron, when the *Spaniards* came amongst them. And if in those late Ages of the World, they were still without the use of Iron, or Iron-tools, we have less reason to believe that the Children of *Cain* had them four or five thousand years before.

p. 250.

It is also worthy our Consideration, how many things must have been done, before they could come at these Iron-tools. How came the Children of *Cain* to dig into the Earth, I know not to what depth, to seek for a thing they had never heard of before? when it was so difficult to dig into the Earth without such Tools: more difficult, methinks, than to build an House without them. But suppose they did this, we know not how; and, amongst many other Stones, or Earths, found that which we call Iron-ore: How did they know the nature and use of it? Or, if they guess'd at that, how did they know the way and manner of preparing it? By Furnaces, Wind-forges, and Smelting-Mills. These would be as hard to make or build, without Iron-tools, as dwelling Houses. And when they had got a Lump of Iron, till they knew how to temper it, they could not make Tools of it still. Unless *Cain's* Children had an Inspiration from Heaven, I do not see how they could discover all these things,

in

in so short a time. And this is only to make good what the Theorist said, that such an Hypothesis *does not want its reasons*. And as to *Tubal-cain*, let those that positively assert that there was no Iron in the First World, tell us in what sense that place is to be understood. For, I believe, Iron or Brass is not once mention'd in all the Theory.

CHAP. XI.

THIS Chapter is to prove that the *Sea was open* before the Deluge. 'Tis something barren of Philosophical arguments, but we will begin with such as it has, which are taken from this Topick, *That the Fishes could not live in our Abyss*: and that for three reasons. First, because it was too dark. 2dly. too close, and 3dly. too cold. As for coldness, methinks he might have left that out, unless he suppose that there are no fish in the frozen Seas, towards the North and South: which is against all sense and experience: for cold countreys abound most in fish. And according to reason, there would be more danger of too much warmth, in those subterraneous waters, than of too much cold, in respect of the Fishes.

Then as to darkness and closeness, this minds me of the saying of *Maimonides*: *That no man ever would believe, that a child could live so many months, shut up in its Mothers Belly, if he never had seen the experience of it.* There's closeness and darkness in the highest degree: and in Animals, that, as soon as born, cannot live without respiration. Whereas Fishes, of all creatures, have the least need of Respiration, if they have any. And as for *darkness*, how many subterraneous Lakes have we still, wherein Fishes live? And we can scarce suppose the Main and fathomless Ocean to have light to the bottom: at least when it is troubled or tempestuous. How the Eyes of fish are, or might be form'd or conform'd, we cannot tell, but we see they feed and prey on the night time, and take baits as greedily as on the day. But it is likely they were less active and agile in that Abyss, than they are now; Their life was more sluggish then, and their motions

Job 38. 8.

motions more flow. As being still in that *womb* of nature that was broke up at the Deluge. And as to Air, they would have enough for their imperfect way of breathing in that state. But if they have a more perfect now, which is still a question: They might have some passages, in their body, open'd, (at the disruption of the Abyss) when they were born into the light and free air, which were not open'd before. As we see in Infants, upon their birth, a new passage is made into their lungs, and a new circulation of the blood, which before took another course.

p. 219,
220.

So much for pretended reasons and Philosophy. The rest of this long Chapter is spent either in consequences made from Scripture, or in a prolix discourse about Rain. As to Scripture, He makes this the first objection, that, whereas *Adam* had a dominion given him over the fish of the Sea, it could have no effect, if they were enclosed in the Abyss. *Adam* had no more dominion given him over the fish of the Sea, than over the fowls of the Air: which he could not come at, or seize at his pleasure, unless he could fly into the air after them. *Adam* was made Lord of all Animals upon this Earth, and had a right to use them for his conveniency, when they came into his power. But I do not believe that *Adam* was made stronger than a Lyon, nor could master the Leviathan, or command him to the shore. He had a right however, and his posterity, to dispose of all creatures for their use and service, whensoever, upon occasion offered, they fell into their power.

p. 225,
226.*Gen. 1. 17.*

Next he says, The Waters were gather'd into one place, and a Firmament was made to divide the Waters from the Waters. Well, allow this, tell us then what was that Firmament. For it is said there, that God set the Sun, Moon, and Stars, in the Firmament. Therefore you can argue nothing from this, unless you suppose Supercelestial Waters: which, when you have prov'd, we will give you an account of the Subcelestial, and of the Subterraneous. And here the Excepter cites some things from the Theory, that are not in the second Edition, and therefore the Theorist is not concern'd to answer them.

Lastly,

The Theory of the Earth.

53

Lastly, The Excepter comes to his long Harangue in commendation of the *Clouds* and of *Rain*: which takes up a great part of this Chapter. In his Exordium he makes this Complement to the Clouds. *Sometimes they mount up and fly aloft, as if they forgot, or disdain'd the meanness of their Origin. Sometimes again they sink and stoop so low, as if they repented of their former proud aspirings, and did remorseful humble penance for their high presumption. And though I may not say they weep to expiate their arrogance, or kiss the earth with bedewed cheeks in token of their penitence; yet they often prostrate in the dust, and sweep the lowest grounds of all, with their misty foggy trains. One while they, &c.* This Harangue about the Clouds and Rain, is pursued for fourteen or fifteen pages, and, with submission to better judgments, I take it to be a Countrey-Sermon, about the *usefulness of Rain*. And, I believe, whosoever reads it, will, both from its matter and form, be of the same opinion. I do not speak this in derogation to his Sermon, but he would have done better, methinks, to have printed it in a pamphlet by it self; there being no occasion for it in this Theory.

p. 234

Towards the conclusion of the Chapter, He answers an objection made by the Theorist against the supposed Islands and Continents in the First Earth. Namely, *That it would render the propagation of mankind difficult, into those broken parts of the World.* And the many imperfect shifting answers which the Excepter gives, or conjectures without authority, do but confirm the objection of the Theorist, or make his words true, *quod Res esset difficilis explicatu.* Which is all that the Theorist said upon that Subject.

p. 246

CHAP. XII.

THIS is a short Chapter, and will be soon dispatch'd. 'Tis to prove that the *Rainbow* was before the Flood. And notwithstanding that, a good sign that there should never be a Flood again. This is to me a Paradox, but he confirms it by a greater Paradox: for he says, God might as well (as to significancy, or authenticalness) have appointed the *Sun*, as the

An Answer to the late Exceptions made against

the Rainbow, for a sign that there never should have been another Flood. So that if God had said to Noah, I do assure thee there shall never be a second Deluge, and for a sign of this, *Behold I set the Sun in the Firmament*: This would have done as well, he says, as the Rainbow. That is, in my judgment, it would have done nothing at all, more than the bare promise. And if it had done no more than the bare promise, it was superfluous. Therefore if the Rainbow was no more than the Sun would have been, it was a superfluous sign. They to whom these two signs are of equal signification and effect, lye without the reach of all conviction, and I am very willing to indulge them their own opinions.

p. 257.

2 Kings 13.
17.

But he says, *God sometimes has made things to be signs, that are common and usual.* Thus the fruit of a Tree growing in Paradise, was made a sign of man's Immortality. But how does it appear that this was a common Tree: or that it was given to Adam as a sign that he should be Immortal? neither of these appear from Scripture. Secondly, he says, *Shooting with bow and arrows upon the ground, was made a sign to Joash of his prevailing against the Syrians.* This was only a command to make war against Syria, and a Prophecy of success; both deliver'd in a Symbolical or Hieroglyphical way. The command was signified by bidding the King shoot an arrow, which was the sign of War. And the sign of Victory or of divine assistance, was the Prophets strengthening the King's hands to draw the Bow. This is nothing as to a sign given in Nature, or from the Natural World, in confirmation of a Divine Promise: which is the thing we are only to consider.

Eng. Theor.
book 2. ch. 5.

All the rest of this Chapter is lax discourse without proof. And as to the signification of the Rainbow, upon supposition that it was a New Appearance: And its insignificance upon supposition that it was an Old Appearance, we have spoken so fully in the Theory it self, that it would be needless here to make any longer stay upon this argument.

CHAP. XIII.

THIS Chapter is concerning *Paradise*; But our Author fairly baulks all the difficulties in that Doctrine, and contents himself with a few generals, which every body knows. The Doctrine of Paradise consists chiefly of two parts; the site or place of it: and the state or properties of it. As to the first, If the Excepter wou'd have confuted the Theory, he should have set down the Conclusions that are advanc'd by the Theory, concerning the place of Paradise, which are these; First, The place of Paradise cannot be determin'd by Scripture only. Neither the word *Mekeddem*, (*Gen. 2. 8.*) nor the four Rivers mentioned there, make the place of it defineable. Secondly, The place of Paradise cannot be determin'd by the Theory. Seeing then neither Scripture, nor Reason determine the place of Paradise, if we will determine it, it must be by Antiquity. And if we appeal to Antiquity in this case, we shall find, first, that it was not in *Mesopotamia*. Secondly, that according to the plurality of Votes, both amongst the Heathen and Christian Authors, it was plac'd in the other Hemisphere. And this is all the Theory says upon that Point. As you may see *Eng. Theor. Book 2. ch. 7.* and *Lat. Theor. 2d. Edit. p. 194. & p. 214, 215.* Wherefore if the Animadverter would undertake to confute the Theory in this Point, he should have confuted those four Particulars. But he slips over these, and gives us only a Paraphrase upon some Verses in the 2d. and 3d. Chap. of *Gen.* which says little to this purpose, and yet more than it proves.

*Eng. Theor.
book 2. ch. 7.*

p. 265:

In the Second place, As to the state and properties of Paradise, or the Antediluvian world; *The longevity of the Antediluvians* is the thing he insists upon. But this he handles so loosely, that in the conclusion of his discourse, one cannot tell whether he affirms it, or denies it. This Sceptical humour of the Excepter hath been taken notice of before, and 'tis continued in this Chapter, where there is little or nothing positively determin'd. The Theorist, on the contrary, expressly

p. 273.

H

affirms

affirms the Longevity of the Antediluvians, and gives these reasons for his assertion. First, because all the Lives, and all the Generations recorded in Scripture, before the Flood, from Father to Son, in a Line of sixteen hundred years, are longeval. Of six, seven, eight, nine hundred years a-piece. Secondly, Antiquity, both *Greek* and *Barbarian*, have attested the same thing, and recorded the Tradition. Thirdly, the Generations recorded in Scripture after the Flood, as they exceed the term of succeeding Ages, so they decline by degrees from the Antediluvian Longevity. Lastly, *Job* complains of the shortness of his life, and fewness of his days, in comparison of his Forefathers, when he had liv'd one hundred and thirty years; which had been a groundless complaint, if his Ancestors had not lived much longer.

See the Table of both.
Eng. Theor.
p. 220.

Gen. 47-9.

These two last reasons the Excepter has not thought fit to take notice of. And, in answer to the two former, he hath onely the usual subterfuges. As, that the long lives of the Antediluvian Patriarchs was a thing extraordinary and providential: confin'd to their Persons; not of a general extent, nor according to the course of Nature. But how does this appear? It must be made out, either by Scripture or Reason. Scripture makes no distinction, nor exception of Persons in this case; All, whereof it hath left any account, as to term of life, are declar'd to have liv'd several hundreds of years. And why should we not conclude the same thing concerning the rest? Then as to Reason, you cannot suppose Longevity, in that World, against reason or nature, unless you first suppose the form and constitution of that World to have been the same with the present: Which is to beg the Question. Admitting that form and constitution of the first Heavens and Earth, which the Theory hath given, Longevity will be a natural consequence of it. And having such a course of nature laid before us, as agrees with the reports of Scripture, and with general Tradition, why should we quit that, to comply with an imaginary presumption: that these were miraculously preserv'd, and all the rest were short-liv'd. I know he pretends, we may as well conclude all Men were Gyants

Theor. bo. 2.
ch. 3. & 4th.

p. 277.

ants in those days, because *Moses* says, *There were Giants upon the Earth in those days*, Gen. 6. 4. as conclude that all Men were long-liv'd in those days, because *Moses* mentions some that were so. There had been some pretence for this, if *Moses* had made a distinction of two races of Men in the first World: Long-livers and short-livers; as he hath distinguish'd the Giants from the common Race of Mankind. Or, as he hath said in one case, *There were Giants on the Earth in those days*. So if he had said in the other, *there were Long-livers upon the Earth in those days*: and upon that, had given us a List of the Long-liv'd Patriarchs: this indeed would have made the cases pretty parallel. But, on the contrary, *Moses* makes no such distinction of long-living and short-living races, before the Flood; nor yet notes it as a mark of divine favour, or extraordinary benediction upon those persons that liv'd so long. Therefore, not to suppose it general to Mankind at that time, is a groundless restriction, which is neither founded upon Scripture nor Reason.

As to the second Argument for Antediluvian longevity, taken from Tradition and the Testimony of the Ancients; He objects, that *Josephus* does not seem to be firm in that opinion himself. But what then? The Theorist lays no stress upon *Josephus's* single opinion, but refers to the Testimonies of those Authors, whether *Greeks*, or such as have given an account of the *Ægyptian*, *Chaldean*, and *Phœnician* Antiquities: which are call'd in by *Josephus*, as witnesses of this Truth or Tradition, concerning the long lives of the first Men. And at last, the Excepter seems content, this Tradition should be admitted: seeing the *Authors are too many, and too considerable, to have their Testimonies question'd or rejected*. But then he will make a further Question, *Why there should not also be a Tradition concerning the Perpetual Equinox, or Perpetual Spring, upon which this Longevity depended*. But this Question is fully answer'd, and the Tradition fully made out before, in the 8th. Chapter, which I need not here repeat. In like manner, all the secondary Questions which he there mentions, depending upon, and being included in this first, receive their resolution from it. For when a per-

p. 276, 277.

p. 278.

An Answer to the late Exceptions made against

petual Equinox is once truly stated, there is no difficulty concerning the rest.

19,280. After these contests about Traditions, he hath one or two *Reasons* against this *Antediluvian Longevity*. First, Because the Earth, by this means, would have been over-stockt with People before the time of the Deluge. Secondly, They should all have been of the same Longevity before the Flood. Neither of these, methinks, have any strength in them. As to the first, That Earth was much more capacious than this is, where the Sea takes away half of its Surface, and renders it uninhabitable. And whereas he suggests, as a recompence, *That Mountains* have more surface and capacity than Plains; That's true, but they are also less habitable, by reason of their barrenness and ruggedness. Who can believe that there are as many People in *Wales*, as in other parts of *England*, upon the same compass of level ground? Or no more in *Holland*, than upon a like number of Acres upon the *Alpes* or *Pyreneans*? There would be room enough for twice as many People as there are in the World, and twice as many Animals, if there was food enough to nourish them. But here I have two things to complain of, as foul play: First, the Excepter cites the Theory partially. Secondly, he does not mark the place whence he takes that citation: as if it was on purpose to hide his partiality. The words he cites are these, *If we allow the first Couple, at the end of one hundred years, or of the first Century, to have left ten pair of Breeders, which is an easie supposition, there would arise from these in fifteen hundred years, a greater number than the Earth was capable of: allowing every pair to multiply in the same decuple proportion the first pair did.* Here the Excepter stops, and makes this inference, that upon an *easie supposition*, which the Theorist makes and allows, the Earth would have been over-stockt in fifteen hundred years. This is an *easie supposition* for the first Century, as the Theorist put it: But it would be a very uneasy one for the following Centuries; when they came to be at any considerable distance from the beginning. And therefore the Theorist tells you, in that very Page, *The same measure cannot run equally through all the Ages.* And in his Calculation

ibid.

Eng. Theor.
p. 23.

culatation you see, after the first Century, he hath taken only a *quadruple proportion for the increase of mankind*. As judging that a *moderate and reasonable measure betwixt the Highest and the Lowest*. This the Excepter might easily have observed, and as easily avoided this misapplication of the words of the Theorist.

ibid.

His second reason against the antediluvian longevity is slighter than the first. For he pretends that all the Antediluvians, upon that supposition, should have been equally long-liv'd. You may as well say, that all the children of the same parents, and that live in the same place, should now be equally long-liv'd; the external world being the same to them all. But, besides accidents, their *stamina* and constitutions might then be of a different strength, as well as now: tho' they were born of the same Parents, and liv'd in the same Air. Lastly, he moves a difficulty about the multiplication of Animals in the first World, that they would have been too numerous before the Flood. I can say nothing to that, nor He neither, upon good grounds: unless we knew what Species's of Animals were then made, and in what degrees they multiplied. The Theorist always supposes a Divine Providence to superintend, proportion, and determine, both the number and food of Animals upon the Earth: suitably to the constitution and circumstances of every World. And seeing that Earth was no less under the care and direction of Providence, than the present, we may conclude that due measures were taken for adjusting the numbers and food of Animals in such manner, as neither to be a burthen to one another, nor to man.

p. 280.

p. 281.

C H A P. XIV.

THIS Chapter is against the Explication of the Deluge by the *Dissolution of the Earth*. That dissolution, as is pretended, being unfit or insufficient to produce such an effect. And to prove this, the Antitheorist gives us five Arguments, whereof the first is this: *Moses* having left us an accurate description of Paradise, according to the proper rules of *Topography*, such a description would have been improper and insufficient

p. 285.

cient

cient to determine the place of Paradise, and consequently useless, if the Earth had been dissolv'd: and by that means the bounds of those Countreys, and the Channels of those Rivers, broken and chang'd. This objection, I'me afraid, will fall heavier upon *Moses*, or upon the Excepter himself, than upon the Theorist. However one would have expected that the Excepter should have determin'd here the place of Paradise, in vertue of that description. So learned and sagacious a person, having before him an exact draught of Paradise, according to the proper rules of Topography, could not fail to lay his finger upon the very spot of ground where it stood. Yet I do not find that he hath ventur'd to determine the place of Paradise, either in this Chapter, or in the precedent. Which gives me a great suspicion, that he was not satisfied where it stood, notwithstanding the Mosaical Topography. Now if it cannot be understood or determin'd by that Topography, one of these two things must be allowed, either that the description was insufficient and ineffectual: or that there has been some great change in the Earth, whereby the marks of it are destroy'd; namely, the bounds of Countries, and the courses of the Rivers. If he take the second of these answers, he joyns with the Theorist. If the first, he reflects, according to his way of arguing, upon the honour of *Moses*, or confutes himself.

p. 286.

But here is still a further charge: *Moses's* description of Paradise would have been *False* (which he notes for *horrid blasphemy*) if the Earth was broken at the Deluge. For then those Rivers, by which *Moses* describes Paradise, could not have been before the Flood. But why so, I pray? The Theorist supposes Rivers before the Flood, in great plenty: and why not like to these? And if their channels were very much chang'd by the Flood, that's no more than what good Interpreters suppose. Being unable, upon any other supposition, to give an account, why it is so hard (notwithstanding *Moses's* description) to determine the place of Paradise. Now where is the *Blasphemy* of this: *Horrid Blasphemy against the holy Ghost*? A rude and injudicious defence of Scripture, by railing and ill language,

ibid.

guage, is the true way to lessen and disparage it. Especially when we make our own consequences to be of the same authority with the Word of God: and what soever is against them, must be charg'd with blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Is it not a strange thing that the Dissolution of the Earth should be made Blasphemy? when the Prophets and inspir'd Authors speak so often of the *Disruptions, Fractiōns, Concussions*, and *Subversions* of the Earth. And that very expression, that the *Earth is dissolv'd*, is a Scripture-expression. (*Psal.* 75. 3. *Isa.* 24. 19. *Amos* 9. 5.) which, methinks, might have been enough to have protected it from the imputation of blasphemy. But there is nothing safe against blind zeal, and opinionative ignorance; which, by how much they find themselves weaker in reasons, by so much they become more violent in passions.

But to return to the objection; upon the whole matter, he casts the burthen of the charge upon *Moses* himself, as we noted before. For take whether Hypothesis you will, that the Earth was, or was not, broken: the question still returns, if the Mosaical Topography was exact and sufficient, why can we not yet find out the situation of Paradise? 'Tis now above three thousand years since *Moses* dyed, and men have been curious and very inquisitive, in all ages, to find out the place of Paradise: but it is not found out to this day to any satisfaction. So that, methinks, upon the whole, the Theory, which supposeth the Earth very much chang'd, makes the fairest Apology both for *Moses* and mankind, in this particular. But to proceed to his second Argument.

Secondly, says the Excepter, *The dissolution of the Earth could not be the cause of the general Flood, because it would have utterly destroy'd Noah's Ark, and all that were in it.* I thought the Theorist had effectually prevented this objection, by putting the Ark under the conduct of its Guardian Angels, and of a miraculous Providence. These are his words, *I think it had been impossible for the Ark to have liv'd upon the raging Abyss, or for Noah and his family to have been preserv'd, if there had not been a miraculous hand of Providence to take care of*

See Review;
p. 35, &c.

p. 288.

Eng. Theor.
p. 108.

of them. Now, either the Excepter did not take notice of this passage in the Theory, or he does not allow that a miraculous hand was sufficient to preserve the Ark: or thirdly, he made an objection, which he knew himself, to be impertinent. And, I confess, I am inclinable to think the last is true. For as to the first, he confesses (p. 354.) that the *Theory represents the Ark, with its Guardian Angels about it, in the extremity of the Flood.* And as to the second, He himself makes use of a miraculous power to preserve the Ark, upon his Hypothesis: in answer to the eighth objection, p. 351, 352, &c. Why then may not we make use of the same power and with the same effect? It remains therefore, that he was conscious to himself that he made this objection to no purpose.

p. 98.

But that is not all: He has also us'd foul play in his citation. For whereas the great danger of the Ark would be at the first fall of the Earth, or the disruption of the Abyss; The Theorist, he says, to prevent this, makes the Ark to be a-float by the Rains, before the Abyss was broken. But is that all the Theorist says in that place? does he not assign another way how the Ark might be a-float? namely, in a River, or in a Dock. These are the words of the Theory, *So as the Ark, if it could not float upon these Rain-waters, at least taking the advantage of a River, or of a dock or cistern made to receive them, it might be a-float before the Abyss was broken open.* And these words being in the same place whence he makes his citation, it must be a wilful dissimulation not to take notice of them. But he see they would have taken off the edge of his objection, and therefore thought fit not to touch upon them. But after all, there is no necessity that the Ark should be a-float, before the Earth broke. Those things were premis'd in the Theory, only to soften the way to men that are hard of belief in such extraordinary matters. For the Angels, (whose ministry we openly own, upon these grand occasions) could as easily have held the Ark, a-float, in the Air, as on the water. And the Ark, being an Emblem of the Church, God certainly did give his Angels charge over it; that they should bear it up in their hands, that it might not be dash'd against

a stone. And this having been more than once, profest by the Theorist, we must again conclude this objection superfluous and useless.

The third objection is this. If the Earth had been thus dissolv'd, *The present Earth would have been, in likelihood, of another figure, than what now it bears.* These are his words, but I suppose he means, that it would have been of another form, as to Sea and Land. And the reason he gives is this: Because, says he, it would have broke first, in the Equator, and consequently that part falling down first, would have been swallowed up by the waters, and become all Sea. Whereas we find, that under the Equator that then was (which he supposeth the present Ecliptick) *the dry ground is of most spacious extent and continuity.* We need not examine his account of Sea and Land, because it proceeds upon a false supposition. He relapses here into his former Astronomical error, or to his first adds a second; viz. That the Earth, when it chang'd its situation, chang'd its Poles and Circles. This is a great mistake; the change of position in respect of the Heavens, did not change the places of its Circles in respect to its own Globe. As when you change a Sphere or a Globe out of a *right situation* into an *oblique*, the Circles do not change their places, as to that Sphere or Globe: but have only another position to the Heavens. The Earth's Ecliptick runs through the same places it did before: and the Equinoctial regions of that Earth were the same with the Equinoctial regions of this; only bear another posture to the Heavens and the Sun. These Circles have not chang'd places with one another, as he imagines: and which is worse, would father this imagination upon the Theory; in these words, *under the Ecliptick (which, in the Primitive situation of the Earth, (ACCORDING TO THE THEORY) was its Equinoctial, and divided the Globe into two Hemispheres, as the Equator does now) the dry ground, &c.* He that affirms this, with respect to the Earth, neither understands the *Theory*, nor the *Doctrine of the Sphere*. But let's press no further upon a mistake.

The fourth objection is this: That such a Dissolution of the Earth, would have caus'd great barren-

p. 289.

ibid.

See p. 27.
before.

p. 290.

ness after the Flood. Partly by turning up some dry and unfruitful parts of the Earth: and partly by the soil and filth that would be left upon its surface. As to the first, I willingly allow, that some of the interior and barren parts of the Earth might be turn'd up; as we now see in Mountainous and wild Countries: but this rather confirms the Theory, than weakens it. But as to the second, that the filth and soil would have made the Earth more barren, I cannot allow that. For good Husbandmen overflow their grounds, to make their crop more rich. And 'tis generally suppos'd, that the Inundation of *Nile*, and the mud it leaves behind it, makes *Ægypt* more fruitful. Besides, this part of the objection lies against the common explication of the Deluge, as well as against that which is given by the Theory. For if you suppose an universal Deluge, let it come from what causes you please, it must overflow all the Earth, and leave mud and slime and filth upon the surface of it. And consequently cause barrenness, according to this argumentation.

p. 292.

He adds another consideration under this head, namely, that if the Earth had been dissolv'd in this manner, *All the buildings erected before the Flood, would have been shaken down, or else overwhelmed. Yet we read of some that outstood the Flood, and were not demolish'd. Such were the pillars of Seth, and the Cities Henochia and Joppa.* As to *Seth's* pillars, they are generally accounted fabulous. And I perceive the excepter will not vouch for them. For he concludes, (p. 295.) *I know the very being is question'd of Seth's pillars, &c.* If he will not defend them, why should I take the pains to confute them? I do not love to play with a Man, that will put nothing to the stake. That will have his chance to win, but can lose nothing, because he stakes nothing. Then as to the City *Henochia*, it hath no authority, but that of *Annius Viterbiensis*, and his *Berosus*. A Book generally exploded, as fictitious. Lastly, as to *Joppa*, the authority indeed is better, though still uncertain. But however, suppose the ruins of one Town remain'd after the Flood, does this prove that the Earth was not dissolv'd? I do not doubt, but there were several tracts of the Earth, much greater than
that

that Town, that were not broken all to pieces by their fall. But you and your *English* Historian are mistaken, if you suppose the Altars and Inscriptions mention'd by *Mela*, to have been Antediluvian Altars and Inscriptions. Unless you will make the Fable of *Perseus* and *Andromeda*, and the *Sea-Monster*, to have been an Antediluvian Fable. Neither hath your Historian been lucky in translating those words of *Mela*, *cum religione plurimâ*, with the grounds and principles of their religion, which signifie only, with a religious care or superstition. But to leave Fables, and proceed.

His last Argument against the Dissolution is this. Had the Dissolution of the Earth been the cause of the Deluge, *It would have made God's Covenant with Noah a very vain and trifling thing.* So much is true, That the Deluge, in the course of Nature, will not return again in the same way. But unless God prevent it, it both may and will return in another way. That is, if the World continue long enough, the Mountains will wear and sink, and the Waters in proportion rise: and overflow the whole Earth. As is plainly shewn, by a parallel case, in the *first Book* of the *Theory*, *ch. 4.* Besides, God might, when he pleas'd, by an extraordinary power, and for the sins of Men, bring another Deluge upon the World. And that is the thing which *Noah* seems to have fear'd, and which God, by his Covenant, secur'd him against. For, as the Excepter hath said himself, in answering an harder objection, (p. 152.) *When God assigned to the Waters the place of their abode, he did not intend to fortifie them in it against his own omnipotence, or to devest himself of his Sovereign Prerogative of calling them forth when he pleased.* This being allow'd, with what we said before, that Covenant was not vain or trifling, either in respect of an ordinary or extraordinary Providence.

Thus we have done with all the Exceptions against the Theory. For the two next Chapters are concerning a new Hypothesis of his own. And the last of all, excepts not against the truth of the Theory, but the certainty of it. In reflection upon this whole matter, give me leave to declare Two things; First, That I have not knowingly omitted any one Objecti-

on that I thought of moment. Secondly, That I have not from these Exceptions found reason to change any part of the Theory, nor to alter my opinion, as to any particular in it. No doubt there are several Texts of Scripture, which, understood according to the Letter in a Vulgar way, stand cross, both to this, and other natural Theories. And a Child that had read the first Chapters of *Genesis*, might have observ'd this, as well as the Excepter: but could not have loaded his charge with so much bitterness. Some Men, they say, though of no great Valour, yet will fight excellently well behind a Wall. The Excepter, behind a Text of Scripture, is very fierce and rugged. But in the open Field of Reason and Philosophy, he's gentle and tractable. The Theorist had declar'd his intentions, and oblig'd himself, to give a full account of *Moses* his *Cosmopœia*, or *six-days Creation*: but did not think it proper to be done in the Vulgar Language, nor before the whole Theory was compleated. This might have spar'd much of the Excepter's pains; But till that account be given, if the Excepter thinks fit to continue his Animadversions, and go thorough the Two last Books, as he hath done the two first, it will not be unacceptable to the Theorist. Provided it be done with sincerity, in reciting the words, and representing the sence of the Author.

*Eng. Theor.
book 2. ch. 9.
at the end.*

CHAP. XV.

p. 299.

IN This Chapter the Anti-theorist lays down a new Hypothesis for the Explication of the Deluge. And the War is chang'd, on his side, from Offensive, to Defensive. 'Tis but fair that he should lie down in his turn: and if some blows smart a little, he must not complain, because he begun the Sport. But let's try his Hypothesis, without any further ceremony. The first Proposition laid down for the establishing of it, is this: *That the Flood was but fifteen Cubits high, above the ordinary level of the Earth.* This is an unmerciful Paradox, and a very unlucky beginning; For under what notion must this Proposition be receiv'd?

p. 297, 300.

ceiv'd? As a *Postulatum*, or as a *Conclusion*? If it be a *Postulatum*, it must be clear from its own light, or acknowledg'd by general consent. It cannot pretend to be clear from its own light, because it is matter of Fact, which is not known, but by Testimony. Neither is it generally acknowledg'd: For the general opinion is, that the Waters cover'd the tops of the Mountains; Nay, that they were fifteen Cubits higher than the tops of the Mountains. And this he confesses himself, in these words: *We shall find there is a great mistake in the common Hypothesis, touching their depth: namely, of the Waters. For Whereas they have been supposed to be fifteen Cubits higher than the highest Mountains: They were indeed but fifteen Cubits high in all, above the Surface of the Earth.* And this Opinion, or Doctrine, he calls, *The general standing Hypothesis: The usual Hypothesis: The usual sence they have put upon the Sacred Story.* It must not therefore be made a *Postulatum*, that such an Hypothesis is false, but the falsity of it must be demonstrated by good Proofs. Now I do not find that this new Hypothesis, of a *fifteen-cubit-Deluge*, offers at any more than one single proof, namely, from *Gen. 7. 20.* But before we proceed to the examination of that, give me leave to note one or two things, wherein the new-Theorist seems to be inconsistent with himself, or with good sence.

p. 300.

p. 329. lin.
19. c. 31.
p. 339. lin.
18.

At his entrance upon this new Hypothesis, he hath these words, (P.300.) *Not that I will be bound to defend what I say, as true and real, &c.* But why then does he trouble himself, or the World, with an Hypothesis, which he does not believe to be *true and real*? or if he does believe it to be so, Why will he not defend it? for we ought to defend truth. But he says moreover, (p.302. lin. 19.) *Our supposition stands supported by Divine authority: as being founded upon Scripture. Which tells us, as plainly as it can speak, that the Waters prevailed but fifteen Cubits upon the Earth.* If his Hypothesis be founded upon Scripture: and upon Scripture *as plainly as it can speak*, Why will not he defend it as *true and real*? For to be supported by Scripture, and by plain Scripture, is as much as we can alledge for the

Articles

Articles of our Faith: which every one surely is bound to defend.

But this is not all the difficulty we meet with. The whole period which we quoted runs thus. *Not that I will be bound to defend what I say, as true or real; any more than to believe (what I cannot well endure to speak) that the Church of God has ever gone on in an irrational way of explaining the Deluge. Which yet she must needs have done, if there be no other rational method of explaining it, and no other intelligible Causes of it, than what the Theory has propos'd;* Now for the word *Theory*, put the word *Excepter*, or *Excepter's Hypothesis*, and see if this charge, *That the Church of God has ever gone on in an irrational way of explaining the Deluge*, does not fall as much upon the Excepter's new Hypothesis, as upon the Theory. If the Church-Hypothesis was rational, what need he have invented a new one? why does he not propose that Hypothesis, and defend it? I'me afraid it will be found that he does not only contradict the Church-Hypothesis, but reject it as mistaken and irrational. For what is the Church-Hypothesis, but the *Common Hypothesis*? (p. 300. lin. 24.) The *general standing Hypothesis*: The *usual Hypothesis*: The *usual sence they put upon the Sacred story*. All these he rejects and disputes against; as you may see in the places fore-cited. And also he calls them such *Inventions*, as have been, and justly may be *disgustful*, not only to nice and squeamish, but to the best and soundest *Philosophick judgments*. And, p. 319. He says by his Hypothesis, *we are excused from running to those Causes or Methods, which seem unreasonable to some, and unintelligible to others, and unsatisfactory to most*. And, to name no more, he says, p. 330. The ordinary supposition, that the Mountains were cover'd with water in the Deluge, brings on a *necessity of setting up a new Hypothesis for explaining the Flood*. Now, whose Methods, Inventions and Suppositions are these, which he reflects upon? Are they not the commonly receiv'd Methods and Suppositions? 'Tis plain, most of those which he mentions, (p. 310, 311, 313, 314, 318.) are not the Theorist's. For the Theorist had rejected before, those very Methods and Inventions, which the Excepter rejects now:

p. 312. ult.

Eng. Theor.
ch. 2. & 3.

now: and so far he justifies the Theory *. These reflections therefore must fall upon some other Hypothesis: And what Hypothesis is that, if it be not the Church-Hypothesis? To conclude, I argue thus in short, to show the Excepter inconsistent with himself in this particular. The Church-way of explaining the Deluge, is either *rational* or *irrational*. If he say it is *rational*, why does he desert it, and invent a new one? And if he say it is *irrational*, then that dreadful thing, which, he cannot well *endure to speak*, That the Church of God has even gone on in an *irrational* way of explaining the Deluge, falls flat upon himself.

* The Excepter rejects, first the *Waters of the Sea*. Then the *Waters in the bowels of the Earth*. Then the *Supercelstial Waters*. Then a *New Creation of Waters*. Then the *mass of Air* chang'd into water. And lastly, a *partial Deluge*. And therefore he puts men fatally, either upon the Theory, or upon his new Hypothesis.

Thus much in general, for his Introduction. We proceed now to examine particularly his new Hypothesis. Which, as we told you before, consists chiefly in this, That the Waters of the Deluge were but *fifteen Cubits higher than the common unmountainous Surface of the Earth*. This, which seems so odd and extravagant, he says is the *Foundation* of his Hypothesis. And, which is still more surprising, he says this depth, or rather shallowness, of the Waters of the Deluge, is told us by Scripture, *as plainly as it can speak*. This must needs raise our curiosity, to see that place of Scripture, which has been over-lookt by all the Learned hitherto. Well, 'tis Gen. 7. 20. in these words, *Fifteen Cubits upwards did the Waters prevail*. This, me thinks, is somewhat general: for the Basis of these *fifteen Cubits* is not exprest, in these words. But why does our Author stop in the middle of a Verse: Why does he not transcribe the whole Verse: for the last part of it, is as good Scripture as the first. And that says plainly, that the *Mountains were cover'd with the Waters*. The whole Verse runs thus: *Fifteen Cubits upwards did the Waters prevail; AND THE MOUNTAINS WERE COVERED*. Now, if the Basis of these *fifteen Cubits* was the common Surface, or plain level of the Earth, as this new Hypothesis will have it: How could *fifteen Cubits*, from that Basis, reach to the tops of the Mountains? Are the highest Mountains but *fifteen Cubits* higher

p. 301.

p. 302. lin. 21.

1 Sam. 17. 4. higher than the common surface of the Earth? *Goliath* was six cubits and a span high. So *Pic Tenariff* would not be thrice as high as *Goliath*. Yet *David* flung a stone up to his forehead. Take what cubit you please, Sacred or common, it does not amount to two foot. So the height of the greatest Mountains, from bottom to top, must not be thirty foot, or ten paces: according to this New Hypothesis. Who ever measured Mountains at this rate? The modern Mathematicians allow for their height a mile perpendicular, upon a moderate computation; and that makes 3000 foot. How then could waters that were not 30 foot high, cover Mountains that were 3000 foot high? That the highest Mountains of the Earth were cover'd with the waters, you may see express'd more fully in the precedent verse. *And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the Earth. And all the high Hills that were under the whole Heaven were cover'd.* There can scarce be words more plain and comprehensive. The Excepter says, the Scripture tells us, as *plainly as it can speak*, that the waters were but fifteen cubits high from the common surface of the Earth. And I say, The Scripture tells us as *plainly as it can speak*, That, *all the high Hills under the whole Heaven, were covered with water.* And it must be a strange sort of Geometry, that makes fifteen cubits of water reach to the top of the highest Hills. Lastly, the same History of *Moses* says, the tops of the Mountains were discover'd, when the waters begun to decrease, *Gen. 8. 5.* Is not that a plain demonstration that they were cover'd before, and cover'd with those waters.

We may therefore safely conclude two things. First, that this new Hypothesis, besides all other faults, is

* This he acknowledges, p. 325. (*We expound a Text or two of Scripture so as none ever did; and deserting the common receiv'd sense, put an unusual Gloss upon them, not to say, ιδίαν ἐρμηνειν, a private interpretation,*) and p. 359.

contrary to the general exposition of the text of *Moses**. Secondly, that it is contrary to the general receiv'd Doctrine of the Deluge. And if he has deliver'd a doctrine, contrary to these two, methinks, it should be hard for him to maintain his ground, and not pronounce at the same time, what he dreads so much to speak, *That the Church of God has ever gone on in an irrational way of explaining the Deluge.* But

But let's reflect a little upon this Fifteen-cubit Deluge; to see what figure it would make, or what execution it would do upon mankind and upon other Creatures. If you will not believe *Moses* as to the overflowing of the Mountains, at least, I hope, you will believe him as to the universal destruction made by the Deluge. Hear his words, *Gen. 7. 21, 22, 23*: we'll take only the last verse, which is this, *And every living substance was destroyed, which was upon the face of the ground. Both man and cattle, and creeping things; and the fowl of the heavens; and they were destroyed from the Earth: and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the Ark.* Now I would gladly know how this could be verifed in a fifteen-cubit Deluge. The birds would naturally fly to the tops of Trees, when the ground was wet. And the Beasts would retire by degrees to the Mountains and higher parts of the Earth, as the lower begun to be overflow'd; and if no waters could reach them there, how were they all destroy'd, while they had so many Sanctuaries and places of refuge?

Or if you suppose some of these Creatures had not wit enough to save themselves, (though their wit and instincts lie chiefly in that) at least mankind would not be so stupid: when men see the waters begin to rise, they could not fail to retire into Mountains. And tho' the upper stories of their houses might be sufficient to save them from fifteen cubits of water; yet if fear made them think themselves not secure there, whither could it drive them, but still into higher places. And an House seated upon an Eminency, or a Castle upon a Rock, would be always a safe retreat from this diminutive Deluge. I speak all this upon the suppositions of the Excepter, who allows not only Mountains and Rocks, but also Castles and Cities before the Deluge: built of good Timber, and Stone, and Iron, and such substantial materials. But how in such a case, and in such a state of things, all mankind (except *Noah*, and his Family) should be destroy'd by fifteen cubits of water, is a lump of Incredibilities, too hard and big for me to swallow.

p. 215, 216,
292, &c.

But there is still another difficulty, that we have not mention'd. As those that were upon the Land might easily save themselves from ruine, so those that were upon the Sea, in ships, would never come in danger. For what would it signifie to them; if the Sea was made a few fathoms deeper, by these new waters? It would bear their vessels as well as it did before, and would be no more to them than a Spring-tide. And lastly how shall we justify the Divine Wisdom, which gave such punctual orders, for the building of an Ark, to save *Noah*, and a set of Creatures, for a new World: when there were so many more easie and obvious ways to preserve them, without that trouble?

p. 330.

p. 332,
333.

p. 337.

p. 339.

These objections, in my opinion, are so plain and full, that it is not needful to add any more. Nor to answer such evasions as the new Theorist attempts to make to some of them. As for instance, to that plain objection from *Moses's* words, that *the Mountains were cover'd with the waters*, he says, first, that it is a *Synecdoche*, where the whole is put for a part. Or Secondly, 'tis an *Hyperbole*: where more is said than understood. Or Thirdly, 'tis a *Poetical History*. Or Lastly, if none of these will do, by the *Tops* of the Mountains is to be understood the *bottoms* of the Mountains: and that cures all. The truth is, he has taken a great deal of pains in the next Chapter to cure an incurable Hypothesis. We will give you but one instance more. 'Tis about the *appearance of the tops of the Mountains at the decrease of the Deluge*. Which argues strongly that they were cover'd in the Deluge. But take it in his own words, with the answer, *It is recorded, Gen. 8.5. that the waters decreased continually until the tenth month, and on the first day of the month, WERE THE TOPS OF THE MOUNTAINS SEEN.* Now if the mountains had not been quite under water, and so invisible for the time they were overwhelmed; how could they be said to become visible again, or to be seen upon the Floods going off? This is a plain and bold objection. And after two answers to it, which he seems to distrust, his 3^d and last is this: *If these two considerations will not satisfie, we must carry on the enquiry a little further, and seek for a Third. And truly some one or other must needs be found out.-----*

Thirdly

Thirdly, therefore we consider: that the tops of the mountains may be said to be seen, at the time mentioned, upon account of their *EMERGENCY OUT OF DARKNESS, NOT OUT OF WATERS*. This is his final Answer. The tops of the Mountains, at the decrease of the Deluge, were seen: not that they were covered before with water, says he, but with darkness. Where finds he this account? 'tis neither in the Text nor in reason. If it was always so dark, and the tops of the Mountains and Rocks naked and prominent every where, how could the Ark avoid them in that darkness? Moreover, If the Deluge was made in that gentle way that he supposes, I see no reason to imagine, that there would be darkness, after the forty-days-rain. For these rains being fallen, and all the Vapours and clouds of the Air, discharg'd, methinks there should have ensued an extraordinary clearness of the Air: as we often see after rainy seasons. Well, 'tis true: But the rains, he supposes, were no sooner fallen, but the Sun retracted them again in Vapours: with that force and swiftness that it kept the Air in perpetual darkness. Thus he says afterwards. He's mightily beholden to the Sun, upon many accounts: and the Sun is no less beholden to him: for he gives him a miraculous power to raise Mountains, and draw up Waters. 'Tis well the Sun did not presently fall to his old work again, of raising Mountains out of this moist Earth: as the Excepter says he did, when the Earth was first drain'd. That he contented himself now to suck up the Waters only, and let the Earth alone: We are not a little beholden to him for this. For he seems to have had the same power and opportunity, at the decrease of the Deluge, of making new ravages upon the Earth, that he had before when it was first drain'd. But let's see, *how* or *when*, these waters were suck'd up, or resolv'd into vapours.

p. 342

See ch. 10.

Upon the expiration of the 40 days rain, whether was the Air purg'd of Vapours and clear, or no? Yes, it was purg'd. He says (p. 343.) *The Atmosphere was never so exhausted of Vapours, and never so thin: as when the waters were newly come down.* Then in that clear Air, the tops of the Mountains might have been seen, if

Gen. 8. 5.

p. 341.

p. 343.

they lay above water. But *Moses* says, it was in the *Tenth Month* that they begun to be seen, when the Waters were decreas'd; 'twas therefore the Waters, not the gross Air, that hindered the sight of them before. And according to this Method of the Excepter, after the first Forty days, the Deluge begun to decrease. For the Sun forth-with set his Engines a work, and resolv'd the Waters into vapor and exhalations, at such a rate, that he presently made all the Atmosphere dark with thick Mists and Clouds: and, in proportion, lessen'd the Waters of the deluge. But we do not read in *Moses* of any abatement in the Deluge, till the end of one hundred and fifty days; (*Gen. 8. 3.*) which is four Months after this term. The truth is, The whole notion of *spending the Waters of the Deluge by Evaporation*, is no better than what the Excepter suspected it would be thought: *A meer fancy, a whimsical groundless figment.* For what could the Sun do, in the Northern and Southern parts of the World, towards the exhaling of these Waters? And in the temperate Climates, why should they not fall again in Rains, (if he had a power to exhale them) as they do now? Was not the Earth in the same position, and the Sun of the same force? Besides, where does he find this notion in Scripture, that the Waters of the Deluge were consum'd by Evaporation? *Moses* says, the Waters returned from off the Earth, in going and returning: *Gen. 8. 3. 5.* that is, after frequent reciprocations, they settled at length in their Channels. Where bounds were set them, that they might not pass over: that they return not again to cover the Earth. Seeing therefore this notion hath no foundation, either in Scripture or reason, 'tis rightly enough styl'd, in the Excepter's words, *a meer fancy, and groundless figment.*

p. 303.

But I think we have had enough of these shifts and evasions. Let us now proceed to the 2d. part of his new Hypothesis, which is this: That the *Abyss* or *Tehom-Rabbah*, which was broken open at the Deluge, and (together with the Rains) made the Flood, was nothing but the Holes and Caverns of Rocks and Mountains: which open'd their mouths at that time, and pour'd out a great quantity of Water. To support

port this new notion of *Tehom-Rabbah*, he alledgeth but one single Text of Scripture: *Psal. 78. 15. He clave the Rocks in the Wilderness, and gave them drink, as out of the Great Depths.* That is, copiously and abundantly, as if it were out of the great Deep. So the next Verse implies, and so it is generally understood. As you may see both by Interpreters, and also by the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate* Translations, and those of the *Chaldee Paraphrase* and the *Syriack*. But the Excepter, by all means, will have these holes in the Rocks to be the same with the *Mosaical Abyss*, or Great Deep, that was broken open at the Deluge. So the *Great Deep* was not one thing, or one continued Cavity, as *Moses* represents it, but ten thousand holes, separate and distant one from another. Neither must the Great Deep, according to him, signify a *low place*, but an *high place*. For he confesses these Caverns were higher than the common level of the Earth*. But I do not see, how, with any tolerable propriety or good sense, that, which is higher than the Surface of the Earth, can be call'd the *Great Deep*. An *Abyss*, in the Earth, or in the Water, is certainly *downwards*, in respect of their common Surface. As much as a *Pit* is *downwards*. And what is downwards from us, we cannot suppose to be above us, without confounding all dimensions, and all names, of things. Calling that *low*, which is *high*: a Mountain a Valley, or a Garret a Cellar.

Neither is there any thing in this Text, *Psal. 78. 15.* that can justly induce us to believe the *Great Abyss* to be the same thing with Caverns in Rocks. For whether you suppose it to be noted here as a miraculous thing, that God should give them Water out of a Rock, or out of a *FLINT**, as plentifully, as if it had been out of the Great Abyss. Or whether you understand the original of Fountains to be noted here: which are said in Scripture to come from the Sea, or the great Abyss; neither of these senses make any thing to the purpose of the new Hypothesis, and

* p. 303. But though these Caverns be called *Deep*s, we must not take them for profound places, that went down into the Earth, below the common Surface of it: on the contrary, they were situate above it.

* *Psal. 114. 7, 8. Tremble thou Earth at the presence of the Lord, at the presence of the God of Jacob, Which turned the Rock into a standing water, the flint into a fountain of Waters.*

Num. 20. 10, 11. And Moses and Aaron gathered the Congregation together, before the Rock, and he said unto them, Hear now you rebels: must we fetch you water out of this Rock? And Moses lift up his hand, and with his rod he smote the Rock twice: and the Water came out abundantly.

yet they are the fairest and easiest sence that can be put upon the words: and that which agrees best with other places of Scripture, where the same matter of fact, or the same History is related. And therefore there can be no necessity, from the Text, of changing the general notion and signification of *Deep* or *Abyss*. Both from that which it hath in common use, and that which it hath in Scripture-use.

I say, as in the common use of words, *Deep* or *Abyss* signifies some low or inferiour place: So the general use of it in Scripture, is in the same sence. Either to signifie the Sea, or some subterraneous place. *Who shall descend into the Abyss or Deep*: says the Apostle, *Rom. 10. 7.* Is that as much, as if he had said, *Who shall ascend into the holes of the Rocks?* And when *Jacob* speaks of the blessings of the *Abyss*, or of the *Deep*, he calls them the blessings of the *Deep that lyeth under*: *Gen. 49. 25.* In like manner, *Moses* himself calls it the *Deep that coucheth beneath*: *Deut. 33. 13.* And I know no reason why we should not understand the same *Deep* there, that he mentioned before in the History of the Deluge. Which therefore was subterraneous, as this is. Then as for the other use of the word, namely, for the Sea, or any part of the Sea, (whose bottom is always lower than the level of the Earth) that is the most common use of it in Scripture. And I need not give you Instances, which are every where obvious.

One must needs think it strange therefore, that any Man of judgment should break thorough, both the common use of a word, and so many plain Texts of Scripture that shew the signification of it, for the sake of one Text; which, at most, is but dubious. And then lay such stress upon that new signification, as to found a new doctrine upon it. And a doctrine that is neither supported by reason, nor agrees with the History of the Deluge. For, as we noted before, at the decrease of the Deluge, the Waters are said to *return from off the Earth*: *Gen. 8. 3.* Did they not return to the places from whence they came? but if those places were the Caverns in the Rocks, whose mouths lay higher than the Surface of the Deluge, as he says they

they did: I see no possibility of the Waters returning into them. But the Excepter hath found out a marvellous invention to evade this argument. He will have the *returning* of the Waters, to be understood of their returning into their Principles, (that is, into vapors) not to their Places. In good time: So the Dove's *returning*, was her returning into her Principles: that is, into an Egg, not into the Ark. Subtleties ill-founded, argue two things, wit and want of judgment. Moses speaks as plainly of the local return of the Waters, *in going and returning*; as of the local going and returning of the Raven and Dove. See Gen. 8. 3, & 5. compar'd with Verse 7th. & 9th.

Lastly, That we may end this Discourse, the whole notion of these Water-pots in the tops of Mountains, and of the breaching of them at the Deluge, is a groundless imagination. What reason have we to believe, that there were such Vessels then, more than now: if there was no Fraction of the Earth, at the Deluge, to destroy them? And he ought to have gag'd these Casks, (according to his own rule*) and told us the number and capacity of them, that we might have made some judgment of the effect. Besides, if the opening the Abyss at the Deluge, had been the opening of Rocks, why did not Moses express it so: and tell us, that the *Rocks were cloven, and the waters gushed out*, and so made the Deluge? This would have been as intelligible, if it had been true, as to tell us that the *Tehom-Rabbah* was broken open. But there is not one word of *Rocks*, or the *cleaving of Rocks*, in the History of the Flood. Upon all accounts therefore, we must conclude, that this Virtuoso might have as well suspected, that his whole Theory of the Deluge, as one part of it, would be accounted a *meer fancy*, and *groundless figment*.

* ch. 3.

p. 343.

CHAP. XVI.

THIS Chapter is made up of Eight Objections, against his own Hypothesis. And those that have a mind to see them, may read them in the Author. I have taken as much notice of them, as I thought

thought necessary, in the precedent Chapter: and therefore leave the Excepter now to deal with them all together. I omitted one objection (p. 311.) concerning the shutting up of the Abyss, and the Fountains of the Abyss, because it was answer'd before in the English Theory, p. 104. namely, There were fountains in the Abyss, as much as Windows in Heaven: and those were shut up, as well as these; that is, ceas'd to act, and were put into a condition to continue the Deluge no longer.

CHAP. XVII.

THERE is nothing in this Chapter against the Truth of the Theory, but the Author is blam'd for believing it to be true. I think he had been more blame-worthy, if he had troubled the World with a Theory which he did not believe to be true: and taken so much pains to compose, what he thought himself no better than a Romance. As to what the Theorist has said in reference to his assurance or belief of the Theory, which the Excepter calls *positiveness*: upon examination, I cannot find any thing amiss in his conduct, as to that particular. For, first, he imposes his sentiments upon no man: He leaves every one their full liberty of dissenting. *Preface to the Reader*, at the end. *Lastly, in things purely speculative, as these are, and no ingredients of our Faith, it is free to differ from one another, in our opinions and sentiments; And so I remember S. Austin hath observ'd, upon this very subject of Paradise. Wherefore as we desire to give no offence our selves, so neither shall we take any at the difference of judgment in others. Provided, this liberty be mutual, and that we all agree to study PEACE, TRUTH, and a GOOD LIFE.* And as the Theorist imposes his Sentiments upon no man, so, as to matter of certainty, he distinguisheth always betwixt the *substance* of the Theory, and *particularities*. So, at the latter end of the *First Book*, this profession is made; *I mean this only, speaking about certainty, as to the general parts of the Theory. For as to particularities, I look upon them only as problematical: and accordingly I affirm nothing therein,*
but

but with a power of revocation, and a liberty to change my opinion when I shall be better inform'd. And accordingly, he says in another place: I know how subject we are Eng. Theor. p. 96. to mistakes, in these great and remote things, when we descend to particularities. But I am willing to expose the Theory to a full triall, and to shew the way for any to examine it, provided they do it with equity and sincerity. I have no other design than to contribute my endeavours to find out truth, &c. Lastly, To cite no more places, he says, There are many particular explications that are Eng. Theor. p. 288. to be consider'd with more liberty and latitude: and may, perhaps, upon better thoughts and better observations, be corrected, &c. The Theorist having thus stated and bounded his belief or assurance, and given liberty of dissenting to all others, according to their particular judgments or inclinations, I see nothing unfair or undecent in this conduct. How could the Observator have made it more unexceptionable? Would he have had the Theorist to have profess'd Scepticism: and declar'd that he believ'd his own Theory no more than a Romance or phantastical Idea? That had been, both to bely his own conscience, and to mock the World. I remember I have heard a good Author once wish, That there were an Act of Parliament, that whoever Printed a Book, should, when he took a Licence, Swear, that he thought the Contents of his Book to be true, as to substance. And I think such a method would keep off a great many impertinencies. We ought not to trouble the World with our roving thoughts, meerly out of an itch of Scripturiency, when we do not believe our selves what we Write. I must always profess my assent to the substance of that Theory: and am the more confirm'd in it, by the weakness and inefficacy of these Exceptions.

We need not take notice of the particular citations he makes use of, to prove this *positiveness* of the Theorist. For they only affirm, what we still own, That the Theory is more than an *Idea*: or that it is not an *Imaginary Idea*: or that it is a *reality*. And, together with its proofs from Scripture: especially from S. Peter: hath more than the certainty of a bare *Hypothesis*, or a *moral certainty*. These are the expressions he cites,

E

and

An Answer to the late Exceptions made against

and we own all, that, in fair construction, they amount to. And find no reason, either from the nature of the thing, or from his objections, to change our opinion, or make any Apology for too much positiveness.

p. 43.

I wish the Excepter had not more to answer for, as to his *Partiality*: than the Theorist hath, for his *positiveness*. And now that we draw to a conclusion, it will not be amiss to observe, how well the Excepter hath answered that character, which he gave himself at the beginning of his work. These are his words. *This I will endeavour to do, namely, to examine the Theory, with all sincerity; and that only as a Friend and Servant to Trnth. And therefore with such Candour, Meekness, and Modesty, as becomes one who assumes and glories in so fair a Character: And also with such respect to the Virtuoso who wrote the Theory, as may testify to the world, that I esteem his Learning, while I question his Opinion.* 'Tis of little consequence what opinion he has of the *Virtuoso*, as he calls him. But let us see with what *sincerity* and *meekness*, he has examin'd his Work. As to his sincerity, we have given you some proofs of it before (p. 26.) both in his defective and partial citations: and also, in his never taking notice of the last Edition of the Theory: where several citations he has made use of, are not extant. Now, by his own Rule, he ought to have had regard to this; for he says, (p. 356.) He will there take notice only of the English Edition, as *coming out after the other: and so with more deliberation and mature thoughts of things.* By the same reason, say I, he ought to have taken notice of the last Edition of the Theory, as being the last product, and the most *deliberate and mature thoughts* of the Author. But this, it seems, was not for his purpose.

So much for his Sincerity: Now for his *Meekness*. So impatient he is to fall upon his Adversary, that he begins his charge in the Preface: and a very fierce one it is. (p. iii.) *The Theorist hath assaulted Religion, and that in the very foundation of it.* Here I expected to have found two or three Articles of the Creed assaulted or knock'd down by the Theory. But that

that is not the case, it seems: he understands something more general: namely, our contradicting Scripture. For so he explains himself in the next Page. *In several things (as will appear by our discourse) it contradicts Scripture; and by too positive asserting the truth of its Theorems, makes that to be false, upon which our religion is founded.* Let us remember, that this contradicting Scripture, here pretended, is onely in natural things: and also observe, how far the Excepter himself, in such things, hath contradicted Scripture. As for other reproofs which he gives us, those that are more gentle, I easily pass over: but some-where he makes our assertions *too bold an affront to Scripture.* And in another place represents them, as (either directly, or consequentially) *Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost*: which is the unpardonable Sin: *Matt. 12. 31.*

p. 78.

p. 286.

There is no pleasure in repeating such expressions; and dreadful sentences. Let us rather observe, if the Excepter hath not made himself obnoxious to them. But first, we must state the case truly, that so the blame may not fall upon the Innocent. The case therefore is this, *Whether*, to go contrary to the Letter of Scripture, in things that relate to the natural World, be *destroying the foundations of Religion: affronting Scripture*: and *blaspheming the Holy Ghost*. In the Case propos'd, We take the *Negative*, and stand upon that Plea. But the Excepter hath taken the *Affirmative*: and therefore all those heavy charges must fall upon himself, if he go contrary to the Literal sence of Scripture, in his Philosophical opinions or assertions. And that he hath done so, we will give you some Instances, out of this Treatise of his: *Pag. 314.* He says, *It is most absurd to think, that the Earth is the center of the World.* Then the Sun stands still, and the Earth moves, according to his doctrine. But this is expressly contrary to Scripture, in many places. The Sun rejoices, as a strong Man, to run his race, says *Pf. 19. 5, 6.* David: *His going forth is from the end of the Heaven,* *Jos. 10. 12,* *and his circuit unto the ends of it.* No such thing, says *2 Kin. 20. 13.* the Excepter: The Sun hath no race to run: he is fixt in his seat, without any progressive motion. He hath no course from one end of the Heavens to the other. *Isa. 38. 8.*

In like manner, *Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon*, says the Sacred Author: *and the Sun stood still*. No, says the Excepter, 'twas the Earth stood still, upon that miracle: for the Sun always stood still. And 'tis *absurd*,
 p. 157. *yea most absurd*, to think otherwise. And he blames *Tycho Brahe* for following Scripture in this particular. Now is not this, in the language of the Excepter, to *destroy the foundations of Religion: To affront Scripture: and blaspheme against the Holy Ghost?* But this is not all. The Excepter says, (*Chap. 10.*) the Sun rais'd up the Mountains on the *3d.* Day. And the Sun was not in being till the *4th.* Day: according to Scripture: *Gen. 1. 14.* The Moon also, which according to Scripture, was not created till the *4th.* Day: he says, would hinder the formation of the Earth, which was done
 p. 74. the *3d.* Day. Lastly, In his new Hypothesis, he makes the Waters of the Deluge, to be but fifteen Cubits higher than the Plain, or common Surface of the Earth. Which Scripture affirms expressly to have cover'd the tops of the highest Hills, or Mountains, under Heaven. These two things are manifestly inconsistent. The Scripture says, they cover'd the tops of the highest Mountains: And the Excepter says, they reach but fifteen Cubits, about, or upon the skirts of them. This, I think, is truly to contradict Scripture: or, according to his talent of loading things with great words, *This is not onely flatly, but loudly contradictory to the most express word of the Infallible God.*
 p. 216.

Gen. 7. 19,
20.
Gen. 8. 5.

These observations, I know, are of small use, unless perhaps to the Excepter himself. But if you please, upon this occasion, let us reflect a little upon the Literal style of Scripture: and the different authority of that style, according to the matter that it treats of. The subject matter of Scripture is either such, as lies without the cognizance and comprehension of humane reason, or such as lies within it. If it be the former of these, 'tis what we call properly and purely *Revelation*. And there we must adhere to the literal style, because we have nothing to guide us but that. Such is the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Incarnation: wherein we can have nothing to authorize our deviation from the Letter and words of Scripture. And there-

therefore the School-Divines, who have spun those Doctrines into a multitude of Niceties and Subtleties, had no warrant for what they did, and their conclusions are of no authority.

The second matter or subject of Scripture, is such, as falls under the view and comprehension of Reason, more or less: and, in the same proportion, gives us a liberty to examine the Literal sence: how far it is consistent with reason, and the faculties of our mind. Of this nature there are several things in the Holy Writings, both Moral, Theological, and Natural, wherein we recede from the Letter, when it is manifestly contrary to the dictates of reason. I will give some Instances in every kind. First, as to Moral things. Our Saviour says, *If thy right Eye offend thee, pluck it out.* Mat. 5. 29. *If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off.* 30. There is no Man that thinks himself oblig'd to the Literal practice of this doctrine: And yet it is plainly deliver'd, you see, in these terms, in the Gospel. Nay, which is more, our Saviour backs and enforces the letter of this doctrine with a Reason: *For it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole Body should be cast into Hell.* As if he had intended that his Precept should have been really executed according to the Letter. In like manner, our Saviour says, *If any man will sue thee at Law, and take away thy Coat, let him have thy Cloak also.* And yet there is no Christian so good-natur'd, as to practise this: nor any Casuist so rigid, as to enjoyn it, according to the Letter. Other Instances you may see in our Saviour's Sermon upon the Mount, where we do not scruple to lay aside the Letter, when it is judg'd contrary to the Light of Nature, or impracticable in humane Society.

In all other things also, that lie within the sphere of humane reason, we are allow'd to examine their *practicability*, or their *credibility*. To instance in something Theological: The words of *Consecration* in the Sacrament. Our Saviour, when he instituted the last Supper, us'd these words; *This is my Body*: taking the Bread into his hand. Which words joyn'd with that action, are very formal and expressive. Yet we do not scruple to forsake the Literal sence, and take the words

words in another way. But upon what warrant do we this? Because the literal sence contains an absurdity: Because it contradicts the light of Nature? Because it is inconsistent with the Idea of a Body, and so destroys it self. In like manner, upon the Idea of the Divine Nature, we dispute Absolute Reprobation, and an Eternity of Torments, against the letter of Scripture. And, Lastly, Whether the Resurrection-Body consists of the same individual parcels and particles, whereof the mortal Body consisted, before it was putrified or dispers'd. And whether the *Book of Life* are to be understood in a literal sence.

Phil. 4. 3.
Apoc. 3. 5.
& 20. 12.

The last Head is of such things as belong to the Natural World. And to this may be reduc'd innumerable Instances, where we leave the literal sence, if inconsistent with Science, or experience. And the truth is; if we should follow the Vulgar Style and literal sence of Scripture, we should all be *Anthropomorphites*, as to the Nature of God: And as to the Nature of his works in the external Creation, we must renounce Philosophy and Natural Experience, if the descriptions and accounts given in Scripture, concerning the *Heavens*, the *Earth*, the *Sea*, and other parts of the World, be received as accurate and just representations of the state and properties of those Bodies. Neither is there any danger lest this should affect or impeach the Divine Veracity; for Scripture never undertook, nor was ever designed to teach us Philosophy, or the Arts and Sciences. And whatsoever the Light of Nature can reach and comprehend, is improperly the Subject of Revelation. But some men, out of love to their own ease, and in defence of their ignorance, are not only for a Scripture-Divinity, but also for a Scripture-Philosophy. 'Tis a cheap and compendious way, and saves them the trouble of farther study or examination.

Upon the whole, you see, it is no fault to recede from the literal sence of Scripture, but the fault is when we leave it without a just cause. As it is no fault for a man to separate from a Church: or for a Prince to make war against his Neighbour: but to do the one or the other, without a just cause, is a real

real fault. We all leave the literal sence in certain cases, and therefore that alone is no sufficient charge against any man. But he that makes a separation, if I may so call it, without good reasons, he is truly obnoxious to censure. The great result of all therefore, is this, to have some common Rule to direct us, when every one ought to follow, and when to leave, the Literal Sence. And that Rule which is generally agreed upon by good Interpreters, is this, *Not* to leave the literal Sence, when the subject matter will bear it, without absurdity or incongruity. This Rule I have always proposed to my self, and always endeavoured to keep close to it. But some inconsiderate minds make every departure from the Letter, let the Matter or Cause be what it will, to be an affront to Scripture. And there, where we have the greatest liberty, I mean in things that relate to the Natural world, They have no more indulgence or moderation, than if it was an intrenchment upon the Articles of Faith, In this particular I cannot excuse the present Animadverter; yet I must needs say, he is a very Saint in comparison of another Animadverter, who hath writ upon the same subject, but neither like a Gentleman: nor like a Christian: nor like a Scholar. And such Writings answer themselves.

F I N I S.